

THE CLERGY REVIEW

A PAPAL BLESSING

FOR the second time within its short history the CLERGY REVIEW has been honoured by a letter of commendation addressed to the Archbishop of Liverpool, Chairman of the Editorial Board, by the Cardinal Secretary of State writing for the Holy Father. It is as follows:—

SEGRETERIA DI STATO
di Sua Santità

DAL VATICANO
April 27, 1933.

My Dear Lord Archbishop,

I am desired by the Holy Father to express His pleasure on receiving the IV Volume of the "Clergy Review" and His best wishes for its continued success.

With my kindest regards I am

My Dear Lord Archbishop

Yours very sincerely

E. Card Pacelli.

To His Grace

The Most Rev. RICHARD DOWNEY

Archbishop of Liverpool.

The occasion of this second letter arose out of a visit of one of the editors to Rome. As it was the first time that the editorial staff had been represented in Rome since the inception of the REVIEW, it was considered fitting that we should seek permission to present to the Pope a bound volume. Through the good offices of the Venerable English College I was received in private audience on Wednesday, April 12th. The Holy Father graciously accepted the Fourth Volume of the REVIEW which had been very beautifully bound by a Roman.

firm experienced in this class of work. The cover was of white, richly decorated in gold and stamped with the Papal arms, and lined with white silk.

His Holiness expressed His pleasure at receiving this "beautiful volume." He turned the pages, carefully reading the titles of articles, and observed with approval the varied nature of the contents dealing with every branch of ecclesiastical study and with those topics of the day which most conspicuously demand the attention of the clergy and of Catholics generally. He was particularly impressed by the Homiletic section and showed his approval when I told him that this was a constant monthly feature.

On turning to the first page the experienced custodian of many books observed the name of the Proprietors: "The Universe," The Associated Catholic Newspapers; and, with a flash of recognition, His Holiness said: "Oh, yes; We know this; We have seen it before." I told Him that on a former occasion we had been favoured with His blessing and had received a long letter of approval from the Cardinal Secretary of State.¹

The Holy Father then said how eager He was to welcome literature of this kind, and indeed good books of all kinds. There was a special need for such books to-day. All must read, but especially the Clergy: "If they do not read, there is danger!" He gave a most cordial blessing to the REVIEW, to the Proprietors and Editors, Contributors and Subscribers, and to all who were in any way associated with its success.

Our deep appreciation of the Holy Father's graciousness was enhanced when we observed at close range the enormous labours which He has undertaken during the Holy Year. It is not merely His great functions, such as the Opening of the Holy Door, the Holy Hour, the Easter celebrations; in addition to all this, He is multiplying audiences so as to fill by themselves a long working day. We were told that He gives audience without intermission from early morning up to two, three and even four o'clock. When we left the Papal rooms at one o'clock we met packed throngs of pilgrims who seemed to fill all the audience chambers. Our Roman correspondent tells us this month that on no day

¹ This appeared in the October number, 1931.

since the Holy Year opened has the Holy Father received less than 4,500 pilgrims.

All these fatiguing duties the Pope carries out with a zest and eager interest which reflect the conviction that the Holy Year is to put a period to the world chaos and depression so frequently deplored in the Papal pronouncements. The observation of the spiritual activity of Rome at this moment must inspire with a similar confidence anyone who retains a spark of Christian hope or belief in the efficacy of prayer. Italians and pilgrims from every part of the world, men and women of all ages and conditions of life, are thronging the basilicas and praying publicly or privately with quite intense devotion. It is this unending chain of prayer, of simple exercises meticulously fulfilled, that is the most abiding impression of the Holy Year. As one goes from Blessed Sacrament altar to the Crucifix, to Our Lady and to the "Confession," at any time of the day, one is part of a living stream: a mob of school children, a group of nuns, the students of a seminary, a priest from Germany, America, Africa, a band of workmen—any or all of these may be keeping pace with one in the Jubilee visits which make a somewhat rigorous discipline on a hot Roman afternoon. Pressed for time, our small party completed in one afternoon the twelve different visits to the altars of St. Mary Major's; walked to the St. John Lateran, and repeated the exercises there; and then wound its way up a crowded Scala Sancta on its knees.

After all of which, one at least felt that it was time to call a halt. But the result was an impression of the Church Universal, One, Holy and Apostolic, fixed in the imagination—the result that was so exactly anticipated in the article on the Holy Year printed in our May issue.

T. E. F.

ECONOMIC PLANNING

BY THE REV. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.).

AT first sight it seems rather remarkable that, as the Bolshevik system seems less and less likely to succeed in its grandiose aims of establishing a triumphant super-industrialized communist State, its influence over the minds of our intelligentsia, industrialists, politicians, even our bankers, seems to increase. When the first paroxysms of peace were over and we had time to look at the world, we found the Bolsheviks more or less securely established in the Russian saddle. Public opinion in this country passed through various phases in regard to the communist régime; hostility, indifference, alarm, complacency (when Lenin introduced NEP), alarm again when the activities of Comintern in foreign countries were revealed, interest when the Five Year Plan received its well-organized publicity, and now admiration tempered by uneasiness.

The reason for the uneasiness is easily seen; the idea of a revolution is extremely distasteful to the vast majority of English people. But what is the reason for the admiration? Not the prosperity of Russia, for even the warmest admirers of the U.S.S.R. admit that prosperity has not yet dawned there. Not the freedom of Russian citizens; the espionage and persecution of the O.G.P.U. are common knowledge. So far as one can judge, the real reason is that Russia has a Plan, and an all-embracing Plan. It covers not merely commerce, industry and finance, but science, art, philosophy and religion. The rulers of Russia appear to have a complete, synthetic view of life. They seem to have perceived the purpose of life, and to be organizing all the activities of their subjects for the achievement of that purpose.

No doubt a closer examination would reveal the fact that the ultimate purpose is not quite so clear as it appears to be, though the immediate purpose of industrializing Russia is evident and definite enough. The fundamental weakness of Marxism has always been the fundamental weakness of all materialism; it destroys ultimate values. Even given the final triumph of perfect

communism, with its abolition of the State, private property and class-distinctions, there would still arise in the minds of those who shared in that triumph the question: And now what? Nevertheless, in the meantime the triumph of perfect communism can be represented as an end in itself, even though (perhaps all the more because) there is no certainty, as Lenin frankly admitted, that that triumph will ever come about. And once given this end, it is possible to devise a Plan which appears to offer some hope of achieving it. The Plan has been duly forthcoming, and has won the admiration of many English people, notwithstanding the fact that they are usually thought to be constitutionally adverse to organization on account of their attachment to individual liberty.

Nor is this so paradoxical as it seems. One may be firmly attached to the ideal of liberty and yet dislike muddle, whether in one's own private life or in the society in which that private life has to be lived. "Muddling through" has often been said to be characteristic of our home and foreign policy, and no doubt there have been many who have taken an idiotic pleasure in the description. Yet the pleasure, one imagines, has been due to the suggestion that some purpose or other has been achieved in spite of the muddling, rather than to the accusation of being muddlers. The normal English adult realizes perfectly well the importance and value of order, of organization, of at least some tincture of Plan. This is what he appreciates in Fascism, whatever his general opinion of that system may be; and it is what attracts so many in the administration of Russia to-day, even to the extent of blinding them to the evils of that administration. It is the feeling that in this country our economic system is not a *system* at all, but a haphazard jumble, which explains the modern cry for Economic Planning. For instance, the Chairman of the United Dominions Trust told the City Business Club at Glasgow recently that "the time was over-ripe when serious consideration must be given to economic planning, and that the present economic system, in which there was waste and the deliberate destruction of goods and commodities, shouted aloud for revision." Significantly enough, he referred to Russia as "not muddling through but working to clear-cut plans." He added the remarkable statement that

"Russia is headed for precisely the same goal to which the thoughts of thinking people of this country are addressed" (*The Times*, 21st October, 1932). He can hardly have been thinking of the "goal" of perfect communism, so presumably he meant the goal of a planned economy.

In all this we see a long-overdue reaction against that fatal political philosophy of individualism or *laissez-faire* which took its rise from the rationalist thinkers of eighteenth-century France, and which is not altogether unfairly associated with Adam Smith and the classical economists of the first half of last century, though for its popularity it is chiefly indebted to the early Utilitarians. Mr. J. M. Keynes has described the rise and fall of the doctrine in his book *The End of Laissez-Faire*, and Mr. Henry Clay has offered a cautious caveat against too hastily and completely rejecting it (*The Problem of Industrial Relations*, Ch. XIV.). But the best and most complete account of the theory is that contained in Sir Arthur Salter's *Recovery*, a statement of the world's post-war problems which has been greeted with general applause and agreement.

Politically, the theorists of the *laissez-faire* school would maintain that the State should confine its attention to establishing a framework of laws and institutions for the maintenance of social security, for the suppression of fraud, and for the provision of currency as a medium of exchange. Psychologically, they would rely on the profit-motive to evoke the maximum of activities from the citizens. Ethically, they would claim that the public welfare would be secured by this system of liberty. The real attractiveness of the theory came from its claim that it propounded a system which would regulate itself automatically, without any need for human planning or State-regulation. The automatic regulator was found in the law of supply and demand. This would guide the individual *entrepreneur*, in his search for profit, to provide the goods which the community needed in the right quantity. It would guide investors to put their savings into those industries which best served the consumer, and thus paid the best dividends. The monetary system would secure the adjustment of the balance of trade and indebtedness between different countries. Wages would correspond with the marginal utility of labour (to use a phrase which came later).

Here, of course, we have a system which is the very antithesis of a "planned economy." In theory, it was governed by laws intrinsic to its very nature and to the nature of the "economic man." Any planning was to be done by the individual only, seeking maximum profit for himself, and even that amount of planning was very limited in extent, for, as Sir Arthur Salter puts it: "Those who planned enterprises in every sphere would not so much see, as feel, their way to their market. . . . No extended range of vision was needed or was possible. Production and distribution were regulated by a process that was automatic, elastic and responsive." The naïve belief that the pursuit of private profit would necessarily lead to public welfare was based, so far as Adam Smith was concerned, on his moral philosophy and his faith in an "invisible hand" which would make all things work together unto good. It was strengthened by experience of the bad effects of State interference in industry in the past, and, in the opinion of Mr. Keynes, by the Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest. Underlying it we can see the unproved assumption that every day and in every way the world gets better and better, the uncritical acceptance of a law of progress guiding men and human institutions to some vaguely conceived ideal of perfection. There is, indeed, a fundamental similarity between the theory of *laissez-faire* and the dialectical materialism of Marx which Lenin and his followers have made their gospel. The belief in economic laws is common to both. For the classical economists those laws demanded private enterprise and full individual liberty, and worked in the interests of capitalism; for Marx they produced various types of social and economic organization at various historical epochs, but were leading inevitably beyond capitalism to communism.

The social history of the last hundred years in this country is largely an account of interference with the free working of competitive capitalism either by the State (in the form of statutory regulation of conditions of labour, provision of "social services," publicly owned enterprises of various kinds, tariffs, bounties, etc.), or by those engaged in industry (in the form of trade unions, cartels, trusts and combines, etc.). Free trade, one of the main pillars of classical economic theory, has been abandoned, and the gold standard, which

was supposed to regulate international exchange automatically, has broken down because, we are told, other nations have not observed the "rules of the game." The individualistic philosophy of the early nineteenth century has proved bankrupt, and we no longer profess to base our policy upon it. Nevertheless, disown it as we may, we cannot so easily solve the problems which are a legacy of the days when it dominated the minds of our rulers and legislators.

In the industrial field, one of our main preoccupations to-day is to secure a spirit of co-operation between those who own, or at any rate control, the means of production and those who sell their labour for wages; but all efforts to promote that spirit are confronted by an apparently ineradicable suspicion on the part of the trade unions and an attitude of wary defensiveness on the part of employers. This is traceable to the view, by no means altogether abandoned to-day, notwithstanding its repudiation by the Peace Treaties, that labour is a commodity, and that its price is to be determined solely by the free play of the law of supply and demand. The trade unions fear lest schemes of co-operation between employers and workers weaken their organization and leave the workers again at the mercy of free competition in the labour-market; the employers fear encroachment by the workers upon the control of the enterprise. The idea of business as a co-operative organization between capital and labour is having enormous difficulty in overcoming the view which regards the two parties as mere buyers and sellers of labour-power, the view which dominated the nineteenth century.

Perhaps in no field does the system of free competition appear more attractive than in that of the supply of capital. Here, at least, it would appear that we could safely rely on supply and demand, expressed through the rate of interest and dividends, to secure the optimum distribution of our national resources. But, as a matter of fact, experience has proved that we cannot. To say nothing of mere speculation in stocks and shares such as precipitated the Wall Street crash in 1929, we have the testimony of the Macmillan Committee, reporting in 1931, that "the individual investor can hardly be supposed to have himself knowledge of much value either as to the profitable character or the security of what is offered to him," with striking figures as to

losses incurred by investors (over £50,000,000) between 1928 and 1931. It is further to be noted that even the certainty of a good return upon capital invested does not secure to the public that the capital will be used in a way that benefits the public welfare. What individual members of the public are prepared to pay for when it is offered to them is by no means the same as what considerations of the general welfare require to be provided by industry; yet it is the former and not the latter which under free competition guides the flow of capital into business.

With regard to foreign investment, which has taken place by exporting goods in excess of what is required to pay for our imports of commodities and services, the attraction of high interest rates has so far failed to secure a prudent distribution of capital that, according to Sir A. M. Samuel, British savings to the extent of £2,000,000,000 have been lost abroad in the last sixty years. To the extent of our export of goods on credit to foreigners, our supply of goods at home is diminished, so that prices are higher here than they otherwise would be. This is partially rectified when we receive goods from foreigners by way of interest on our investments abroad; but when default is on so large a scale as that mentioned the effect on our standard of life must be very serious. It is not surprising that from various quarters the demand is being made for some national board to control the flow of capital into industry both at home and abroad.

The complacent vision of England as "the workshop of the world" is a relic of the system of "natural liberty" and its theories of foreign trade. The result of it has been not merely to turn England into a workshop, with its agriculture derelict, but into a stagnant workshop which threatens to become a scrap-heap. The unfettered profit-motive has driven us to do our best to industrialize the world by our exports of capital goods; and the result has been to establish everywhere powerful competitors of our own manufacturers.

Closely connected with our own over-industrialization and our reckless foreign investments is the extremely unequal distribution of wealth in this country, rivalled only by that of the United States and, to some extent, Germany. This phenomenon is a concomitant of com-

petitive capitalism, and is chiefly due to the fact that the owner and investor of capital has a far stronger "pull" than the wage-earner has in the distribution of the product of industry, so that free competition favours the capitalist at the expense of the worker. The idea of the minimum living wage, an integral part of Catholic social teaching, is still considered fanciful and Utopian by many. Yet, had it been accepted and acted upon during the development of industrialism in this country we should not now be confronted with a propertyless proletariat requiring to be saved from starvation or sickness by the "social services" provided by the State, and from ignorance by free State education. Our taxation would have been lighter, our home market of greater importance to our industries, and our population more contented.

This maldistribution of wealth, combined with the joint-stock system, has given rise to the problem of economic dictatorship, on account of the dangerous power given by the concentration of the ownership of much wealth, and of the control of nearly all wealth, in the hands of a few private individuals. This economic dictatorship, in the words of Pius XI (*Quadragesimo Anno*), "is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience." As a consequence of the struggle for economic power, "the State, which should be the supreme arbiter, ruling in kingly fashion far above all party contention, intent only upon justice and the common good, has become instead a slave, bound over to the service of human passion and greed."

The demands so strongly urged to-day for an effective control of trusts, combines and cartels; for a managed currency instead of the supposedly self-regulating gold standard; for a national board to control investment; for a consumers' council to control prices; and for State intervention in other directions, show that the wheel has come full circle. The ideal of a "planned economy" has replaced the Utopia of natural liberty and free competition.

With the general idea of a planned economy the Catholic Church has no quarrel, for she has always

protested against the theories of *laissez-faire* whether in the political or economic order. Those theories have too close an affinity to rationalism and individualism to be anything but repugnant to her. They are a form of that "liberalism" which she has so consistently condemned. "Leo XIII boldly passed beyond the restrictions imposed by Liberalism, and fearlessly proclaimed the doctrine that the civil power is more than the mere guardian of law and order," writes Pius XI (*loc. cit.*), whose social encyclical is as much a protest against the theories of *laissez-faire* as against those of socialism. To grasp the Church's ideal of a planned economy the encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI on the social question must be read and studied.

This is not the place to give a complete account of Catholic social teaching. Here it must suffice to note that two questions at once arise when we hear of a "planned economy." Who is to do the planning; and what purpose is the Plan intended to achieve? To reply to the first question, "The State," is to postpone planning to the Greek kalends, unless it is proposed to adopt the Bolshevik or Fascist régime. The Church prefers to reply: the State must assist industry to organize itself and stimulate it when organized to plan its operations for the welfare of all affected, the State preserving the right to protect the community from merely selfish planning. As to the purpose which planning is to achieve, the danger is that materialism may again mislead us, as it misled the nineteenth century and now misleads the Bolsheviks. Our purpose, the only one which will not fail, must be to secure to all our citizens the wherewithal to live decently and to develop their spiritual capacities according to the light of Christianity; not to achieve the maximum national wealth, or to enrich a few at the expense of the many, or to give Britain the hegemony of the world.

VOCATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

LAST year, contemporaneously with the fifth edition of Canon Joseph Lahitton's *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, there appeared a full and magisterial English presentation of his doctrine.¹ The author, Fr. Blowick, has made an exhaustive study of the subject, and he writes, not as a mere theoretician, but as one who has had much practical experience in directing prospective priests. He has written his book mainly to help his brother priests to be equally competent guides, by showing them the true nature of vocation.

The essential theses of Lahitton have never been open to question since their definite approval by Pius X in 1912. No one may, therefore, maintain that a candidate has a right to ordination before he is chosen by the bishop; or that a natural or supernatural attraction (*attrait*) is necessarily or ordinarily a prerequisite to ordination. Nor may anyone deny that the bishop's call is perfectly lawful when addressed to a subject who is animated by a right intention and has a competent degree of virtue and knowledge.

These theses are the traditional teaching of the Church, and they had never been opposed until the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Then, however, a new theory of vocation appeared in France. Fr. Blowick explains its genesis and traces its growth. It was a desperate remedy for the desperate plight of the Church in that country, where the priesthood had become a mere lucrative career for men who had neither the knowledge nor the spirit of their sacred state. It arose in the houses of retreats and the short course "seminaries" for ordinands which were the first efforts of the bishops to restore a genuine priesthood and initiate reform according to the decrees of the Council of Trent. The theory taught that no one may be ordained unless he

¹ *Priestly Vocation*, by Rev. John Blowick. (pp. viii., 343. Dublin, M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 10s. 6d.)

has received an active interior call of God, bidding him enter the clerical state. It was a welcome doctrine, because it enabled the bishops to exclude the unworthy without giving offence to the rich and powerful.

This modern theory became very widespread. By the nineteenth century it was thoroughly established throughout the Church. All theologians and spiritual writers seem to have accepted it. St. Alphonsus expresses surprise that it appeared so late in the history of theology; he praises the rigidist theologians, Habert and Concina, who wrote on it "very extensively and with great brilliancy."² The theory holds that God has predestined every man to a definite state of life. Some, therefore, He has predestined for the priesthood, and such men outside the priesthood can with difficulty be saved, just as those not predestined can with difficulty be saved in the priesthood. God's predestination is known by His direct call to the soul, and His call is certified by certain signs, namely, sanctity of life, purity of intention, sufficient knowledge and aptitude, but principally by a supernatural attraction to the priesthood felt interiorly. Without that attraction the other signs are insufficient. The attraction, being from God, must be calm and persistent. It is discoverable by its subject in the silence and solitude of his soul when he stills his desires to indifference and waits prayerfully the Divine leading.

Fr. Blowick, following Lahitton, gives a very complete and convincing refutation of this doctrine. It is not scriptural; the five texts quoted for it (Heb. v. 4; John xv. 16; John x. 1-2; Luke x. 2; Acts i. 24) refer to an external call, as the classical interpreters, à Lapide, Estius, &c., teach. Again, it is not supported by doctrinal tradition. This is clear from St. Alphonsus' surprise at its recent origin. The passages quoted in its favour, from St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Bernard, St. Anselm and the Council of Trent do not really support it. Lastly, it is not in harmony with reason. First, there is no known theological category into which the attraction will fit. It is a grace, because supernatural. But it is obviously not habitual grace. Nor is it actual grace, *excitans* or *vocans*, since actual grace

² *Theol. Moral.*, l. VI, n. 802.

is a transient entity, and the attraction is permanent; moreover, actual grace, unlike the attraction, is psychologically imperceptible. It is not the candidate's act of election, persisting as a habit, because it precedes the election and is its cause; and it is not his right intention in seeking the priesthood nor his joy and repose of will in his vocation, for those things presuppose election. Secondly, the theory has objectionable consequences (Fr. Blowick enumerates eight), poisoned fruit from a tainted tree. Thus it generally holds an obligation under sin to follow the Divine interior call. But to embrace the priesthood is to follow the way of the counsels, and a counsel, as St. Thomas says, is placed in the option of him to whom it is given, unlike a precept which imposes necessity and so an obligation under sin. Again, it seriously menaces the hierarchical government of the Church. The most logical of its supporters put tremendous powers in the hands of the confessor; he it is who determines the candidate's call from God and so his claim on the priesthood; the bishop and the superiors appointed by the bishop decide only his external fitness and competent knowledge. Further, the theory destroys the priest's peace of soul. For soon the warm glow of his new priesthood will depart; he will feel the winter of spiritual barrenness and desolation; he will realize in full measure "the disappointments of life, the defeat of good, the success of evil, physical pain, mental anguish, the prevalence and intensity of sin, the pervading idolatries." His Faith itself will often be tested. And he will wonder if possibly he made a false step in accepting the burden of the priesthood, if the attraction he felt was not after all an illusion which deceived both himself and his confessor. It is a cruel temptation, because it strikes at the foundations on which his whole life is erected. The modern theory can offer him little consolation because he doubts its cardinal point, his personal call to the priesthood. Rather it will intensify his anguish, because it tells him that if he is not where God intended him to be, he will with difficulty be saved.

Again, the theory leads to subjectivism and illuminism. It makes the vocation depend too much on personal feelings. And it has an unhealthy affinity with Quietism. And so on, through the eight malignant consequences.

Fr. Blowick is sometimes vigorous in his criticism, but he reasons cogently.

After thus demolishing the modern theory, the author devotes many pages to the exposition and proof of the true doctrine. From Sacred Scripture he gleans two principles which govern the theology of vocation. These are: (1) the call to a public mission is always made by an external voice, perceptible by the senses and employing human words; such were the calls of Abraham, Moses, Aaron, Gideon, Our Lady, the Apostles, St. Paul. (2) The voice manifests itself as an officially divine call, and this either by miracle or by proceeding from a divinely constituted authority. The call of the apostles was confirmed by Our Lord's miracles; that of their successors in full or partial priesthood, by the divinely constituted authority of the Pope and bishops. Sacred Scripture provides further proof in the practice of the apostles when they chose the seven deacons, and in the advice given to St. Titus by St. Paul.

For the witness of tradition Fr. Blowick adduces the Pontifical, the Council of Trent, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, the teaching of Pius X, and the Code of Canon Law. The Pontifical shows the Church anxious about one thing only, the suitability of the candidates: "scis illos dignos esse?" The doctrine of an interior divine attraction finds no place in any of the injunctions to the ordinands. And in the ordination prayers the mind of the Church is that "the bishop calls and God calls through him; the bishop ordains and God ordains. The act of calling to Orders emanates from the power of jurisdiction, and the bishop acts as principal cause, God being simply the first cause. In the Ordination the bishop is the instrumental, God the principal cause. It is the ordination itself which constitutes the definitive and irrevocable call to the priesthood; . . . in the act of imprinting the priestly character on the soul. . . . God finally and completely calls the priest as He did Aaron."³ By the bishop's call and the ordination the priest becomes a mediator between God and men, dispenser of the mysteries of God and constituted for men in the things that appertain to God.

The evidence from the Council of Trent affords a

³ *Priestly Vocation*, p. 215.

telling argument from silence. In Session XXIII the Council deals expressly with Orders, and enters carefully into the qualities required in ordinands and also into the conditions to be observed before admitting candidates into the seminaries now to be founded; but nowhere does it make mention of an interior divine vocation. The word "vocatio" is only once used (in the fourth chapter and its corresponding canon, seven), to reprobate the doctrine that subjects can be called to the ministry by the people or the secular power. It is here clearly used in the active, external sense.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent, "the norm of Catholic Faith and Christian discipline, according to Clement XIII and his predecessors, enumerated sanctity of life, knowledge, faith and prudence, and vocation by the lawful ministers of the Church as prerequisites of Orders; "vocari autem a Deo dicuntur qui a legitimis ecclesiae ministris vocantur."⁴

Pope Pius X approved the essential theses of Lahitton's book. He also imposed a revised catechism on the Roman province, in which are the following question and answer:

Q. Can anyone enter Orders according to his own will?

A. Nobody can at his own will enter Orders, but he must be called by God through his own bishop; that is to say, he must have vocation along with the virtues and aptitudes for the sacred ministry which it requires.

The Code of Canon Law makes clear the Church's discipline, and so her belief, in canon 961, i: "Nemo ex saecularibus ordinetur, qui iudicio proprii Episcopi non sit necessarius vel utilis ecclesiis dioecesis"; and in canon 1363, i: "In Seminarium ab Ordinario ne admittantur, nisi filii legitimi quorum indoles et voluntas spem afferant eos cum fructu ecclesiasticis ministeriis perpetuo inservituros."

Finally, Fr. Blowick argues positively from theological reason. The Church is a perfect society, and must, therefore, have within her constitution the necessary and sufficient powers for choosing her ministers; if personal divine calls are needed for her guidance, she is to that extent imperfect. Again, the Church is a visible society. Her hierarchy is a visible and external

⁴ Part II, Chap. VII, n. 3.

priesthood, and that, not merely materially, as human beings, but formally in the factors of their election. These factors are call, ordination and mission. The ordination is a visible ceremony; the mission is visible, by presentation of bulls, induction, etc. The call is equally visible, if you hold the traditional doctrine of vocation, but not otherwise.

The immense value of the main part of Fr. Blowick's book will be clear from my skeletonization.⁵ He has established beyond controversy the essential theses of the doctrine of vocation. Vocation, in the active sense, is traditionally the call of the Church, and not the interior call of God. But it may be lawfully used in a passive sense to describe God's work in producing a candidate suitable for the Church's call. Fr. Vermeersch writes:⁶ "A young man may be truly said to be called if he is suitable, is impeded by no office, and with a firm and serious will wishes to serve God in the ecclesiastical state." For it is by God's Providence that the subject is fit intellectually and physically, and by the help of God's grace that he has been able to elicit the supernatural act of election and has attained a competent measure of virtue.

The Code authoritatively sanctions the use of "vocation" in this passive sense in canons 1353 and 1357. Canon 1353 orders priests, especially parish priests, to be on the lookout for "*indicia ecclesiasticae vocationis*" in boys, and to protect such boys from the contagion of the world, etc., and to foster in them "*germen divinae vocationis*"; and canon 1357 commands the bishop frequently to visit his seminary, to watch

⁵ The remainder of the work is of equal value. It deals with the position of the bishop and his subordinates as the ministers of vocation, with the rôle of the director and confessor, with recruiting for the priesthood (the duties therein of the Holy Father, of the bishops, of parish and other priests, of Christian parents), with the wrongfulness of impeding vocations to the home or foreign missions, and with the qualities of ordinands. Fr. Blowick teaches clearly, forcibly and with a firm practical emphasis. The book is nicely got up. I have noticed only three misprints: "preserve" for "persevere" (p. 108); "strenthening" (p. 314); "iurus" for "iuris" (p. 319). But is "liceity" an English word? It is not given in the Oxford English Dictionary; and it is an unnecessary coinage.

⁶ *Epitome Iuris Canon.*, Vol. II, n. 687.

carefully over the intellectual and ecclesiastical training of the students, and to inform himself especially at the ordination times, of their character, piety, vocation and progress.

It remains now to determine more accurately the nature of passive vocation. May we speak of God *leading* the young man to the priesthood? Does God work in a special manner in the soul so that the assemblage of graces given may be called peculiarly sacerdotal, at least in this sense that by them God is definitely forming His priest? It is an effort to discover what element of truth there is in the modern theory. On this point Fr. Blowick writes :

Passive vocation, being only another name for the series of graces by which God leads men to any supernatural end whatsoever, for example, the Faith, justification, baptism, confirmation, the religious life, celibacy, Christian marriage, cannot be regarded as a call which is formally sacerdotal. Considered as a vocation it is not peculiar to the priesthood; it is found in all other supernatural processes. It is materially sacerdotal, however, because it is a call and it is connected objectively with the priesthood."⁷

I cannot in this agree with Fr. Blowick. Dr. Mahoney, against whom Fr. Blowick argues at some length, seems to me to be right when he says :

God has, from all eternity, designed certain men for the priesthood, and this divine will in their regard is manifested, in time, by a *special* Providence shaping their lives, and directing their steps towards the altar.⁸

These words express our Catholic instinct in the matter. Fr. J. Creusen, S.J., the distinguished canonist, concurs with Dr. Mahoney's view. In a review of the fifth edition of Lahitton's book,⁹ he writes :

On doit avouer que le Saint-Siège maintient l'usage passif du mot "vocatio" et s'en sert comme tant de théologiens pour désigner *un ensemble de grâces qu'on peut considérer comme une faveur particulière.*

He is considering the use of the word in canons 1353 and 1357 of the Code, and in the oath imposed on ordinands by the Congregation of Sacraments two years

⁷ p. 159.

⁸ *The Secular Priesthood*, p. 66. Italics mine.

⁹ *Nouvelle Revue Théol.*, February, 1933, p. 177. Italics mine.

ago, in which the candidate swears that he is seeking sacred Orders "cum experiar ac sentiam a Deo me esse revera vocatum." (This phrase has almost an attractionist tone, but must be interpreted in conformity with the decision of the Commission of Cardinals of 1912.)¹⁰

Fr. Blowick's view is part of his general doctrine of predestination, on which he holds a tenable opinion indeed, but not, as he seems to think, the only one. He writes:

The divine selection is made by a decree which is logically subsequent to God's foreknowledge of man's free election, free preparation and free entrance into the priesthood. This is the only sense in which God can be said to eternally destine men for the priesthood.¹¹

Theology knows of only one antecedent will of God, namely, the will whereby He wishes all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.¹²

Now there are very many theologians who hold predestination *ante praevisa merita*. These include the Thomists *en bloc*, the Scotists, the Augustinians, and those distinguished Jesuits who are usually called Congruists, namely, Suarez, de Lugo and St. Robert Bellarmine. They hold that from eternity God chooses certain definite individuals for a definite degree of glory before ever their merits are arranged, antecedently then to His foreknowledge of their free activity. But since this glory has to be merited He will, in time, bring them to a definite degree of merit corresponding to the glory predestined, and He will achieve that merit by plying them with efficacious graces. The theologians mentioned do not, however, agree among themselves as to how God achieved human merit. For the Thomists and the original Scotists He achieves it by graces that are intrinsically efficacious and different in kind from sufficient graces; He physically premoves the will to

¹⁰ For the Instruction accompanying the oath says: "maxime interesse ut a limine eiciantur . . . ii qui sacerdotio fungendo non sint apti seu a Deo non sint vocati" (I, n. 3).

¹¹ p. 140.

¹² p. 156.

definite acts of virtue.¹³ According to the Augustinians, He attains it by graces intrinsically efficacious, but morally premoving the will, i.e., infallibly drawing and directing it without physically determining it. In the view of the Congruists God uses His *scientia media* to foresee how the human will will co-operate with His grace, and so fits His grace to the will as to obtain the merit pre-ordained. But however these theologians explain the operation of grace it is clear that God is, in their conception, leading the soul up the ladder of merit. Applying this doctrine to the priesthood, we must say that God predestines His priests in glory from eternity, and then, as a consequence, fashions them in due course unto Himself as vessels of honour and election. This theory of antecedent predestination is by no means dead; it is left untouched in its essence by the rejection of the doctrine of attraction. It is supported by great names, as we have seen. It is, in fact, supported by the greatest of all names in systematic theology, St. Thomas himself. I have not space to analyse his doctrine, but it is perfectly clear from the *Summa Theologica*, Part I, q. 23.

It would seem, however, that theologians of all schools and views should call the graces of the priesthood formally sacerdotal, and recognize in them a special favour of God. For they are efficacious graces, and, as such, given by God precisely to produce a series of actions ordered to a definite end. God wants that end, and therefore gives the graces which He knows will infallibly attain it. And this is true, however you explain the interaction of free will and efficacious grace. Moreover, just as the external graces of seminary discipline and influence, sermons, conferences, pious reading, etc., are directed to the one sole end of forming a suitable and right-intentioned subject for Orders, so too are the real, interior graces that God gives at every step to enable the candidate to use rightly and to benefit by those external graces. This is not to say that the graces of the priesthood are in their nature different

¹³ Interesting researches are at present being carried out by a young German theologian, Dr. Schwamm, into the doctrine of early Scotist writers on physical predetermination. His researches point to the conclusion that the doctrine was Scotist before it was explicitly Thomist.

from others. But they differ in God's intention; they have in this case a different function, to prepare the priest-to-be. Thus God *leads* the student on, not in any felt way or by an attraction that can be perceived, but according to the normal laws of the operation of grace.

The objections I have raised do not touch the essence of Fr. Blowick's book. Its main theses stand. And if it has the circulation which it deserves in the English-speaking countries, it will help to diffuse far and wide the true concept of vocation.

SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

BY THE REV. W. McENTEGART, S.J.

THE issue of *Nature* for October 24th, 1931, included a very interesting supplement, entitled "Contributions to a British Association Discussion on the Evolution of the Universe." The contributors were Sir James Jeans, Abbé Lemaître, Professor Milne, Professor de Sitter, Sir A. Eddington, General Smuts, Dr. Barnes, and Sir Oliver Lodge. A quasi-editorial commentary, prefaced to the "Contributions" by "H.D." (presumably Professor Herbert Dingle), contains some shrewd and comforting criticisms. For him, "The most profound significance of the discussion as a whole lay in the fact that the various speakers not only had no common starting point but also made no attempt to find one. . . . It is an instructive, though exceedingly difficult, task to examine the various contributions in order to discover what was implicitly assumed; and when we do this, however imperfectly, we find a diversity which not only makes us wonder, but also directs attention to the urgent need of defining what actually is the basis of modern physical theory."

He proceeds to display some samples of this wonderful diversity: "Sir James Jeans paid homage to the second law of thermodynamics, which to Sir Oliver Lodge was an idol against which philosophers were to be warned. General Smuts accepted the law but claimed that life was the result of the odd chance which it allows—a remarkable claim, which implies that the chance of life persisting for a single moment longer is inconceivably small. The Bishop of Birmingham started from particular facts (or statements having the appearance of facts) rather than principles, but the arguments which followed seemed to spring more from independent beliefs and hopes than from the promised source. Those beliefs and hopes had no audible echo in the remarks of the other speakers, and the chief 'facts' were treated with scant respect by Professors de Sitter and Millikan

respectively. Sir Arthur Eddington and the Abbé Lemaître built on the field equations of relativity, and the former also on the wave equation of an electron—grounds which were not openly challenged, but which were by no means universally shared. . . . Severely local in time and space, Professor Milne was perhaps justified in assuming the conservation of energy, but Sir James Jeans, taking a wider outlook, had previously spurned that principle. This difference might be reconciled by a slight change in the definition of the word 'energy,' but only the previous day Professor Bohr had been telling Section A of the Association that the concept of energy seemed to be inapplicable to atomic phenomena, and that in the sun and stars the energy might come from nothing! What about the evolution of the universe in that case?"

These candid comments may well invite the earnest attention of Scholastic Philosophers. Let us take in particular the second law of thermodynamics, to which Sir James Jeans "pays homage." Sir Oliver Lodge says of it: "I claim as a physicist that too much attention has been paid to this second law of thermodynamics, and that the final and inevitable increase of entropy to a maximum is a bugbear, an idol, to which philosophers need not bow the knee." And Sir Oliver is by no means the only eminent man of science to remain resolutely erect with his back to the shrine. A lively and penetrating breeze swept down upon the gently swaying fog of the Discussion when Professor Millikan, of Pasadena, California, rose to speak. I cannot forbear to quote his characteristically forthright opening: "Anyone who knows me is quite aware of the fact that I have no qualifications for participating in a discussion of the evolution of the universe, unless perhaps it be because of my interest and activity in the development of our knowledge of the cosmic radiation." He goes on to point out that the opening up of this new field is the work solely of the experimentalist, and that its very existence was wholly unsuspected prior to 1910. A later passage is highly significant: ". . . it follows . . . that the energy carried by the cosmic rays throughout the universe is of the same order of magnitude as, possibly greater than, all other radiant energies combined. In the light of this fact, when one reflects that the second law of thermodynamics, which

has, strangely, been thought by some so determinative for theories of the origin and destiny of the universe, and which may be roughly said to be merely a generalization of the fact always observed *here on earth*¹ that all forms of energy tend to become converted into heat and then to be radiated away from the earth and hence lost to us, one sees *how prone we are to make sweeping generalizations upon insufficient knowledge. This is why the experimentalist has played and always will play* so important a rôle in the progress of science. From the very inception of the experimental method he has continually been bringing to light facts which were not within the theorist's ken even when that theorist had got observational phenomena pieced together, *as he thought*, into a beautifully consistent and 'necessarily related' scheme. With perhaps the largest source of radiant energy as yet unconsidered, may it not possibly be that the thermodynamic theorist has gone too far in his dicta about the origin and destiny of the universe?"

Several of the more modern text-books of scholastic cosmology put forward an argument from entropy as an *a posteriori* proof that the material world must have had a beginning in time. Some of the texts of theodicy carry it a stage further, and elaborate an "entropological argument for the existence of God." The reasoning usually proceeds in some such fashion as this: According to the second law of thermodynamics the sum of energy available for physical operation through exchange is continually and necessarily diminishing. Since the material universe is finite in dimensions, the present amount of such available energy is also finite, and further, the amount existing at any previous time must likewise have been finite. If the material world, therefore, had existed from eternity, the available energy must long since have been exhausted. Hence the world must have had a beginning in time. The theologians continue: A world which begins to exist in time demands the existence of God the Creator.

The same law of "entropy," of course, equally predicts the inevitable doom, after a finite time, of the present active order of the material world. Just as all financial operation would, in time, come to a full stop, if

¹ Italics Millikan's throughout.

every transaction involved the irrecoverable deposit in some immense, impregnable vault, of a definite proportion of the finite amount of capital and currency available, so, when the last quantum of exchangeable energy shall have been transmuted into inoperative radiation, the physical universe will be overtaken by the paralysis of equi-potential stagnation. Such is the conclusion of the theory, voiced in the accents of the "best sellers" of Science.

It is easy to see why Millikan wishes to have this theory thoroughly overhauled and re-examined from the ground up. The startling abundance of the newly-discovered penetrating radiation, which he has so ably investigated, and the unsolved mystery of its origin, make him reasonably suspect the entropy "law" of being one more "Sweeping generalization upon insufficient knowledge." He is by no means satisfied that the ether of space is a cosmic safe-deposit in which energy accumulates without hope of withdrawal.

And some overhauling of our philosophic texts, on all points where they make contact with the findings of Science and scientists, might also be undertaken with profit. The sudden onslaught of the militant atheist "science" of the last century provoked, naturally enough, on the part of Catholic philosophers and apologists, the instinctive adoption of an attitude of stubborn defence-to-the-last-ditch. Nor is it surprising that some of the defenders should have displayed, on occasion, more of zeal than of vision and discretion. When it had become manifest that in more than one field of debate, it was the conclusions and consequence of the assailants' arguments which were unsound, rather than their premisses, the tactics of the defence began to be modified accordingly. As a result, we find at the present day a perhaps increasing tendency to accept too confidently any purely scientific pronouncements, together with a diminishing but still active leaven of the original rigid mistrust. Of the tendency to over-confidence, the widespread acceptance of the "law" of entropy is a palmary example. The hotly maintained assertion that the possibility of spontaneous generation is unthinkable is typical of the other extreme. And either prejudice is apt to weaken our philosophical position. "I am concerned," said Dr. Barnes, in his contribution to the

Discussion, "that we do not give arguments to obscurantists, who claim that the scientific theories of one generation are usually repudiated by the next." We should be no less concerned than the bishop that we do not play into the hands of our opponents, and might very well show more skill than he.² But if we are to avoid pitfalls, we must walk more unswervingly in the ways of our illustrious and ancient guides, the Doctors of Scholasticism. The business of philosophy is with ultimate causes, with the intelligible reasons of being. Science, in the modern sense, examines only the sensible and the measurable as such. It professes to be engaged solely in the correlation of facts of observation. (Scientists, it is true, being human, from time to time philosophize largely, and they generally go wrong, having no sound metaphysic on which to build.) Scholastic philosophy, therefore, is no plastic body of doctrine to be moulded anew in conformity with every latest series of observatory or laboratory bulletins. It is rather, a living and a healthy organism, requiring no surgical operation, major or minor, but only to content itself with the exercise of its proper functions. It subserves theology, to whose end and aim its own, the pursuit of merely natural knowledge, is subordinate. It derives inestimable illumination from Divine Revelation. But it is, I think, a mistake to suppose that philosophy, within its proper sphere, can receive very much benefit from the progress of scientific investigation. The Science of our day surpasses that of ancient and mediæval times enormously, in the multiplicity, the delicacy, and the range of its observations of phenomena, but when it comes to the interpretations and deductions of the scientists, ancients and mediævals are easily superior. They judged that metals might be transmuted, because their philosophy had penetrated to the material unity underlying all corporal being. The moderns have arrived at the same conclusion by how much more circuitous a route, tardily convinced by the ocular evidence of the spectroscope, and the alchemist's

² Of Darwin he says: "Of course his triumph has been signally complete." And later: "... and such statistical investigation as those in R. A. Fisher's recent volume are a triumphant vindication of the potency of natural selection." (The solecism is surely the printer's.) Many eminent biologists attended the meeting.

dream is barely ceasing to be a joke. The ancients, aware that dead grass becomes living ox, and dead beef the living flesh of man, were further satisfied, by sound reasoning, that there is no absolute repugnance involved in "spontaneous" generation. They were, therefore, and quite reasonably, prepared to accept *prima facie* evidence of its occurrence. The moderns, deriding such simplicity, at one time pronounce *ex cathedra* "omne vivum e vivo," on the strength of the negative results of a few experiments; at another, take for granted the possibility of abiogenesis because its occurrence is demanded by their theory of evolution. In either case they profess to be led by the observed facts. The earlier philosophers again, from the simplest and most obvious facts of common observation, by strict ratiocination, concluded that material bodies do not merely appear continuous to the senses, but are so in reality. Modern Science, after endless mazy voyaging, now grounding on atomic shoals, now barely escaping the whirlpools of dynamic vortices, would seem at long last to be drifting on "de Broglie waves" towards the same goal, uncertainly navigated by the aid of the new and very mixed mathematics.

It is reassuring, doubtless, to know that the field equations of relativity and the wave equation of an electron are grounds by no means universally shared, even if not openly challenged at the Discussion. It should not be surprising. Let us hear Professor de Sitter, "I must lay stress on the fact that in using the words 'universe,' 'radius,' 'expansion,' etc., we are really speaking metaphorically, putting an interpretation on the equations which is by no means imperative. There occurs in the equations a certain small quantity, which may be either positive, negative, or zero, and which is interpreted as the reciprocal of the square of the radius of curvature. But both this interpretation, and the assumption tacitly made that it is positive, are entirely gratuitous, and not demanded by the theory. I will, however, continue to use this convenient metaphorical speech." Exercises in hyper-mathematics provide, undoubtedly, an excellent, if limited intellectual discipline. But a discipline which allows of, which indeed cannot dispense with, entirely gratuitous interpretations and tacit assumptions, is certainly no sort of guide, and a very dubious ally in the quest for philo-

sophic truth. At least where revelation is involved, it is surely imperative that we refrain from invoking the uncertain aid of unproven physical hypotheses. That the world was created in time is of faith. The absolute possibility of its existence from eternity was long and vigorously debated in the heyday of scholasticism, by the keenest intellects of the time. The general conclusion was that such possibility could not be shown to be evidently repugnant. But there were recalcitrants who persisted in establishing the *non-esse ab aeterno* from the *non-possesse* which they professed to prove. In the *De Aeternitate Mundi contra Murmurantes*, St. Thomas, maintaining that the repugnance is not evident, remarks: "Si enim esset aliqua repugnantia mirum est quomodo Augustinus eam non vidit . . . mirum est etiam quomodo nobilissimi philosophorum hanc repugnantiam non viderunt." And a little later, with an unwonted touch of acerbity: "Ergo illi qui tam subtiliter eam percipiunt, soli sunt homines, et cum eis oritur sapientia." The reason for this sharpness appears from the *Summa Theologica*, P. 1, q. 76, a. 2, where the body of the article concludes: "Unde mundum incoepisse est credibile, non autem demonstrabile vel scibile. Et hoc utile est ut consideretur, ne forte aliquis, quod fidei est demonstrare praesumens, rationes non necessarias inducat, quae praebeant materiam irridendi infidelibus existimantibus nos propter huiusmodi rationes credere quae fidei sunt." The caveat entered by the Angelic Doctor so long ago has not lost its force to-day. That the *rationes inductae* are based on "scientific" inductions does not assure them of stability. Though they be accepted by the whole "scientific" world, they are not *therefore* irrefragable. The whole "scientific" world is capable of reversing its judgments, and notoriously has done so more than once within living memory. And if anyone is to blush for such inconstancy, it will only be the philosopher who has too trustingly erected his theses on shifting scientific sands. The scientist blandly points out that his theories are at best provisional, and always liable to revision or "restatement" in the light of fresh facts. Touching the entropy argument, it is worth noting that even were the physical theory rigidly established, the conclusion derived therefrom still depends on those same metaphysical assumptions regarding actual infinities, on

which the "Murmurantes" rested, so that it is not as rigidly "a posteriori" as some have supposed. But the vital objection to the argument is that it attempts to establish a conclusion which is an article of defined faith, on grounds which are not, and which of their very nature cannot be beyond reasonable doubt. It is surely even less desirable to offer an argument for the existence of God based on the entropy theory. The Vatican Council has defined that this truth can be known by the light of human reason, and the arguments which that reason can marshal derive no reinforcement from modern physical science. Here again, indeed, were the entropy hypothesis accepted, it could establish nothing independently of a basis of metaphysical argument which is already self-sufficient for the task in hand.

"Severely local in time and space, Professor Milne was perhaps justified in assuming the conservation of energy . . ." How supremely heretical would such words have sounded in the ears of devout physicists less than a generation ago. For if the second law of thermodynamics was an object of worship, the principle of the conservation of energy was the corner-stone of the Temple of Physical Science. Specific energies might disappear, but only by way of transformation. Vanished heat survives as light, as electricity, as molar motion; and these in their turn are changed and changed again. But through every vicissitude of form, the total quantity of energy remains absolutely invariable. The principle of conservation thus formulated was rather an inspired intuition than an orthodox induction. The measure of experimental verification attainable was and remains, necessarily slight. But so long as the application of the principle is not attempted beyond its proper sphere, its assumption is undoubtedly justified. It was not, of course, to be expected that militant scientific materialists would use any such moderation. Over and above the proneness "to make sweeping generalizations upon insufficient knowledge," mentioned by Dr. Millikan, they were attracted by the opportunity to elaborate a decisive argument against the freedom of the will. Assuming the principle to be of universal application, the argument based on it is, in substance, the following: A man possessed of free will could initiate material movement by the sole operation of a non-material agency. Such action would necessarily involve a variation in the total

sum of material energy, which is impossible. Therefore man's will is not free. Since the major premiss of this syllogism is indisputable, and the conclusion is false, the upholder of the freedom of the will must perforce attack the complex minor. The defendant must maintain either (a) that the total quantity of material energy in the universe is not necessarily invariable, or (b) that man's deliberate physical action need not involve any such variation. Textbooks of scholastic psychology have inclined for the most part, to the defence of the second of these two propositions rather than of the first. Some, it is true, cite various authorities outside the School who maintain that the principle of conservation is of valid application only within the inorganic world. This testimony, however, is supposed to have become practically worthless since the publication of the experimental findings of Rubner and Atwater, "*nam differentiae a lege etiam pro organismo versabantur intra limites errorum, ita ut lex prudenter dici debeat probata esse, in quantum hoc in tali materia possibile interim est.*"³ So that Fr. Fröbes, and others elect to rely chiefly on the establishment of proposition (b), which is attempted thus: If the direction of motion of a particle be changed, whilst its velocity remains unaltered, its kinetic energy does not vary. But a simple change of direction in some cerebral motion is sufficient to bring about a bodily movement which would not otherwise take place. In this manner, therefore, the free will can move the body, without any infringement of the principle of the conservation of energy. It is enough that the will should be able by its simple *fiat*, to alter the direction of some minute movement in the brain.

This argument would appear to be invalid. In the first place, though it is obvious enough that muscular movement is originated by some sort of "trigger" action in the brain, some slight impulse serving to disturb a delicate equilibrium, and thus effecting the transformation of a relatively very large quantity of energy, the precise character of this initial impulse is quite unknown. That it should consist in nothing more than alteration of the direction of the motion of a particle is in the highest degree improbable. But, granted that it were so, the

³ Fröbes, *Psychologia Speculativa*, Vol. II, p. 317 (1927).

conservation of energy must still be violated. For the ideal conditions under which alone it might remain intact, do not obtain in the cerebral cortex, nor in any other material medium. The theoretical constancy of energy with directional change of velocity supposes the direction of translation of an isolated particle alone to change. In the concrete, interaction of a dimensionate particle with the medium—ponderable, if such be present, and in every case, with the ether—destroys the possibility of such constancy. The notion of maintaining the philosophic defence of so crucial a doctrine as the freedom of the will by the aid of proposition (b) has always appeared a little fantastic. Now that "Sir James Jeans, taking a wider outlook" than one severely local in space and time, has spurned the principle of the conservation of energy, and Professor Bohr finds the concept of energy inapplicable to atomic phenomena, it is seen to have been largely labour in vain. Not wholly so, perhaps, if lessons can be learnt from mistakes. It is pertinent to inquire if an attitude more reasonable and more secure, because more unpromising, might not have been assumed, in face of the alleged difficulty, from the start. It would seem so.

The freedom of the human will is a fact, patent to, and demonstrable by any average man or woman having the use of reason, and independently of any special education. A more than academic denial of it is only achieved after long and persistent estrangement from some of the first principles of right thinking, when the resultant mental anæmia has become pernicious. The upholders of the conservation of energy professed to have established that principle on purely experimental grounds. When they sought to extend its application to the operations of the human body moved by the mind, it was surely right and proper to demand of them experimental proof. And such proof could never have been produced. For it is to be noted that results similar to those of Rubner and Atwater, mentioned by Fröbes, which are said to agree with conservation *within the limits of experimental error*, here prove nothing. Those limits are amply wide enough to include many times the quantity of energy which could suffice to disturb a neural equilibrium in the cortex, and they are exceedingly likely to remain so. The apologist of free will, then, might very well have "sat tight" in perfect security,

and with no irksome readjustments to make when the bogey of energy conservation was withdrawn. But if he were minded to descend to the arena of physics, engaging the adversary on the latter's ground, a searching examination of the data of the problem must have revealed that no reconciliation was possible between the principle, as then formulated by physicists, and physical motion initiated by the free will of man. The ill-advised attempt to contrive such a reconciliation provides but another instance of the damage arising from a too ready acceptance of the pronouncements of "Science."

The need for a steadfastly critical attitude on the part of the scholastic philosopher towards the oracular utterances of modern physicists grows greater, not less. There has been of late, here in England at least, a tremendous boom in the popularization, especially, of physical science. Even the one-time staid and severely academic Cambridge University Press does not hesitate to announce in large bold type, at the head of its advertisements, "Science a Best Seller." But the information thus offered to the minds of the millions, and, apparently, greedily assimilated by them, is of very dubious quality. It differs only in the unessential trimmings of journalistic presentation from the expositions of the same authors in the less accessible "high-brow" press. Here is a sample from Sir James Jeans: "When we arrange the general phenomena of nature in the new four-dimensional space-time framework provided by the theory of relativity—they become consistent and make sense; if we refuse to do this, they become mere nonsense and compel us to abandon our belief in the uniformity of nature. Thus we must give up our old belief in space and time as objective realities, and replace them by a new framework, in which it is meaningless to speak of a point of space or an instant of time."⁴

And again: "Until quite recently the man of science, like most men, accepted the fundamental ingredients of our experience—space, time, matter and energy—more or less at their face value. The most obvious and superficial interpretation suggested by everyday experience was assumed to correspond fairly closely to ultimate

⁴ From "The Mathematical Aspect of the Universe," an article appearing in the quarterly *Philosophy*, January, 1932, p. 7.

reality. The theory of relativity has shown that we were utterly wrong about space and time . . ."⁵

The "new four-dimensional space-time framework," in which, we are further told, "space and time are inextricably welded together, three dimensions of space being combined with one of time, so as to make something which is neither space nor time," and the absurdities which attach to it, are simply the result of an illegitimate transference to the concrete world of the abstractions of algebra. And that algebra derives from a non-euclidean geometry which itself is valid only in the realms of the imagination. But the most conspicuous instance of the flouting of right reason in "scientific" pronouncements appears in connection with the so-called "uncertainty principle." Recent research in physics has shown that electrons, protons, atoms, etc., heretofore regarded as compact particles, are capable of producing effects attributable only to the inter-action of wave-trains. Attempts to measure simultaneously quantities pertaining respectively to the "particle-aspect" and to the "wave-aspect" meet with no success (as might have been expected). Thus, if in such experiments, a definite value attaches to the velocity of an electron, no precise position can be assigned to it, but, considered as a particle, its distance from any plane of reference can be dealt with in terms of probabilities only. There is nothing surprising in all this. The plain man would say, "Here we have wave-trains which sometimes behave like particles (A rigid particle cannot conceivably behave like a wave-train). The quantitative measurements which I am able to make, can never, by the very nature of things, attain to absolute precision. But when my 'wavicle' is on its particle-behaviour, particle-measurements will be fairly exact, others not. When, however, its undulations are considerable enough to effect my instruments, precise particle-measurements will be out of the question." The expositors of the new development speak in quite another sense. They announce the discovery of a "Principle of Indeterminism in Nature" and go on to explain that it has *uprooted the Principle of Causality*. The ludicrous climax is reached when we are solemnly assured that

⁵ From the concluding paragraph of "Beyond the Milky Way," in *Nature*, November 14th, 1931.

this abolition of "strict causality" makes it possible once more to defend the freedom of the will. Not all, of course, are so completely intoxicated with the new wine of discovery. A letter appeared in *Nature* nearly two years ago, pointing out the underlying fallacy of equivocation which confuses the two senses of the word "determine." But little heed is paid to such remonstrances. Sir Arthur Eddington, and other, lesser disciples, continue to proclaim at frequent intervals, that the new Science is on the side, if not of the angels, at any rate of the soul, as against the old, discredited, "strict causality" materialists.

The root error from which these fantastic aberrations spring is put forward, with an engaging naïvete by Jeans, in his article last cited, as the guiding principle of the new physics. "The dictum *esse est percipi* was adopted whole-heartedly from philosophy—not because scientists had any predilections for an idealist philosophy, but because the assumption that things existed which could not be perceived had led them into a whole morass of inconsistencies and impossibilities." The prime mover in this matter of adoption is acknowledged to have been Einstein. "The great idea which Einstein contributed to scientific philosophy was the principle that if a thing is essentially unobservable then it is not a real thing and our theories must not include it."⁶

More recently, Einstein and de Sitter proclaimed (in *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*), that space is, after all, probably of the uncurved, three-dimensional type. The news quickly filtered through to the popular press, whose docile readers doubtless rejoice that their amended cosmological act of faith must do less violence to their common-sense. Adherents of that developed common-sense which is the Peripatetic Philosophy will, however, be slow to suspect any radical change of heart and mind on the part of the Moguls of Science. The Universe, we are told, is now to be considered unbounded and infinite, not, as formerly, unbounded but finite. On what precise observations, one wonders, must one rely, in proving that this corporeal world is infinite?

⁶ *The New Conceptions of Matter*, C. G. Darwin, p. 81.

COMMUNISM IN SPAIN

By REV. FR. H. MUÑOZ.

THERE is no need to cite proof that Communism is now threatening Spain. Doubt on this point could only arise from ignorance of the happenings in the Peninsula from the end of the dictatorship of General Primo de Rivera and more particularly from the rise of the Republic.

Indeed the great unrest pervading the country is manifest from the occurrence of continuous outbreaks against public order. The succession of strikes of a political character which marked the transition from the dictatorship to the present régime are of common knowledge. The acts of savagery of May 11th, 1931; the dastardly outrages of Castilblanco, Arnero, Bilbao; the revolts of Seville and of the Llobregat; the Andalusian uprising, etc., all are enough to convince the impartial observer that something is seriously wrong with the country, and that unless energetic measures are taken to find a remedy there is little prospect of an early return to right order and peace.

We shall try in the present article to limn out roughly the salient features in the history of Communism in Spain, its activities and organization.

Communism is nothing new in the country for however recent the name may be, the party had certainly existed in practice during the latter part of the last century. To the student who would understand Spanish history, the fact that both the Spanish Republics have originated from Communistic agitation is full of significance and of major importance in the effort to comprehend clearly the real attitude of the nation towards the present Republic.

The number of *anarchists* was sufficiently great during the last century to allow of their holding congresses for the co-ordination of their plans. Thus both in 1870 and 1872 they held two big clandestine meetings in Barcelona wherein were discussed means for bringing about the division of the country into several independent federal

States which indeed was actually effected. That was the period of the so-called *cantonal* or *federal movement* which obtained more especially in the southern provinces. We can credit this anarchist movement with the revolution of 1868 and its culmination in the proclamation of the first Republic in 1873. At that time the anarchists counted among their adherents nearly 300,000 workers grouped into 270 sections. Their doctrine openly disavowing authority aimed at the disintegration of the nation, and was intended to facilitate the dissemination of their pernicious tenets. How strong they were was evident in the frequency of general strikes and in the conflict among the peasants in Andalusia who, in some cases, were supported by a fair number of the workers, as occurred at Morón in 1902. Those industrial towns where the anarchists had centres, such as Barcelona, Seville, Zaragoza, Bilbao and others, gave open proof of the malignant designs of the leaders of anarchy.

The dreadful crimes of "the bloody week" in Barcelona in 1909 can indubitably be traced to them, led on as they were by the bloodthirsty, revolutionary and anarchist, Francis Ferrer Guardia.¹

Growing in audacity with the years their outrages became more and more frequent until by 1923 the whole country found itself a prey to social disturbance and sedition. This necessitated the advent of dictatorship, the only means of rescuing the nation from ruin—a feat achieved by Primo de Rivera with conspicuous success.

The association known as the C.N.T. (National Confederation of Labour) was the chief rallying ground of the revolutionaries. In 1919 it held a congress in Barcelona where it was decided to affiliate the movement to the Third International; at the same time a resolution was passed to send delegates to the Russian leaders informing them of the Spanish adhesion. They appointed a commission of three: A. Pestaña, S. Quemades and E. Carbó. Only the first named succeeded in getting through to Russia; the other two were imprisoned, Quemades in Portugal and Carbó in Italy.

¹ It fills one with amazement to see Ferrer referred to in one of Dr. Inge's publications as "the latest victim of religious bigotry in Europe." The worthy dean may write in good faith though such abysmal ignorance in a writer of repute is utterly inconceivable if not actually blameworthy.

In another congress held clandestinely in 1921 the C.N.T. sent four delegates to the Second Congress of the Third International. These were: J. Maurin, J. Ibánñez, H. Arlandis, and A. Nin.

The advent of the dictatorship placed the C.N.T. in a very awkward predicament for severe measures were taken to repress this sort of Bolshevism. It managed, however, with the utmost secrecy to employ the period in perfecting its methods, so that with the removal of the Dictator it rose up as it were with renewed strength and vigour as was made plainly evident subsequently. Until quite recently the C.N.T. has been under the leadership of the anarchists as the result of the resolution passed in its assembly at Valencia in 1923 creating one national revolutionary committee with provincial subsidiaries.

The funds of the C.N.T. are supplied from three sources: (a) forced contributions from its members; (b) "isolated expropriations" (thefts); (c) supplies from Russia.

Every member of the C.N.T. is required to contribute a minimum of 0.50 centimes per day. As there are at least 800,000 such members, the annual revenue is of 20,800,000 pesetas which sum is devoted to the fabrication of armaments and munitions of all kinds for the approaching revolution and also to the support of the Communist Press and propaganda.

The "expropriations," that is to say the robberies, are not so effective, of course, but it enables one to understand why for a long time the banks have been guarded by armed police.

Finally, the subsidies from Russia are said to exceed many millions and constitute a truly grave danger since their sole purpose is the ruin of the Spanish polity.

It would seem that actually the C.N.T. is split into two principal groups; "moderates" and "extremists." The end in view and the means by which it is to be achieved are identical in both, viz., freedom-giving communism through the social revolution. The point of difference is the "effective moment." "Moderates" seek for time for a careful preparation, while the extremists wish to strike at once lest—as they say—the bourgeoisie should be well equipped for defence.

GENUINE COMMUNIST GROUPS.

I. The P.C.E. (Spanish Communist Party), an affiliation of the C.N.T. and having about 50,000 members, is perhaps the most violently communistic of any group. Its leaders seek to enrol only the workers and the uneducated, not the intelligent class, but hitherto they have not succeeded in entirely eliminating the bourgeoisie, such as the proprietors of socialistic publications the *Rebellion and Control*. They have as chiefs three men who deserve notice: J. Bullejos, the financial administrator; G. L. Trilla, manager director and Press agent, who controls the vile socialistic sheets in the whole country and supplies the Third International with reports of the Spanish propaganda; and M. Adame, responsible for a number of startling outrages. The secret of their success lies in their appeal to the primary savage instincts and blind passions of the populace, and it is for that reason they discourage the educated in their ranks.

II. Another faction is the O.C. (Communistic Opposition) founded by Trotsky in 1930. Their aim is similar to that of the P.C.E., but their work is chiefly confined to propaganda. They are the "intelligentsia" which the P.C.E. rejects, so they are in a manner the communistic bourgeoisie. The foremost among them are A. Nin, who was expelled from Russia as a follower of Trotsky; J. Andrade, an untiring propagandist; L. Aparicio and H. Lacroix. Their principal centre is in Barcelona, which has already a kindred society, the P.C.C. (Catalan Communist Party). The O.C. is not an imminent menace in itself, in the sense that it has very little direct influence with the masses. Nevertheless, it is largely responsible for the flood of Bolshevik literature with which Spain has been deluged since the advent of the Republic.

THE PEASANTS AND WORKERS GROUP.

III. This body has originated from a secession from the Catalan Communist Party. Its chief is Maurin, who was expelled from the P.C.E. and thus had the opportunity to form his own party, independent of Spanish or foreign communistic associations. Most of its members belong to Barcelona where the great issue will be joined between the various communist parties and the State in

the near future. This faction is midway between anarchic Communism, and State Communism. It is thought that unless the doctrines of anarchy are diffused among the peasants the social revolution may experience dire defeat. In collaboration with Maurin there are two other well-known figures: G. Palacios and H. Arlandis.

The quasi perfect organization of all these communistic societies is to be noted. In each district they have "radios" or small propaganda centres among the workers. The *regional federations* are formed from these "radios" and have each their own provincial secretariate and committee. Every *regional federation* has its particular representative at the Central Executive Committee with direct bearing on the political and syndical secretariate.

The *International Red Help Society* is a communist association formed for the protection of the political revolutionaries who are imprisoned. Under the guise of humanitarianism it diffuses communistic literature and propaganda. One is astonished at the amazing flood of Bolshevik literature in Spain!

The *Committee for the Reconstruction of the Revolutionary C.N.T.* is a new association with the object of checking the O.C. It is financed from Moscow with the object of defeating the disciples of Trotsky, and it has its headquarters at Seville with some 100,000 members.

The means for propagating Communism among the working classes is the "cellule" system. A "cellule" may consist of one or several communists who in their workshop or factory try to disseminate anti-class warfare. They are to take advantage of bad working conditions, accidents, low salaries, long hours, etc., anything and everything, in fact, which will attract or influence the workers and excite them to strikes or acts of *sabotage*. When the time is ripe, or when they have succeeded in creating an atmosphere favourable to their plans, they form three bodies to combat the employers. These are known as the *Battle Council*, the *Strike Council* and the *Employer's Council*. When the proposed strike lacks the support of all the workers the appropriate council or committee selects some of its most daring members who, rifle in hand, intimidate their objectors. Should the police stop them, a more open assault by the "organization of self-defence" is en-

gineered. Then, if the civil guard is called upon, the communists bring out their "*Red Army*" well-furnished with weapons and explosives. In this manner perpetual conflict between employers and employees is cleverly fostered, provoking continual discontent among the working classes. The Army and Navy are also being honeycombed by the "cellule" system.

As a whole, however, the country refuses Communism and has no reason actually to be alarmed. The Spaniard is too individualistic to be really affected by its doctrines in spite of the rapidity with which it is endeavoured to spread it in every province. Thus *Castile* possesses some communistic centres in the cities of Madrid, Toledo, Valladolid, Santander, Burgos, León, Palencia. *Valencia* has a few in its industrial towns. *Aragón* has some branches at Zaragoza and around Jaca. *Galicia* is almost exempt except in Vigo and Ferrol. *Asturias* has fallen a victim in some parts of late; its mining districts and the industries around Gijón have witnessed communist activities. In the *Basque Provinces* Bilbao and San Sebastian have centres. Bilbao is a modern industrial town—it has been called the Birmingham of Spain—and such agglomerations often shelter Socialism and Communism. But it is in *Andalucia* and *Catalonia* that the *doctrinaires* are most numerous. Seville and its surroundings have seen many of their riots. The poverty of the peasants there is extreme and contrasts so gravely with the enormous properties of some of the land-holders that the communist theory finds a comparatively easy footing among many. The closing of the giant exhibition of Seville, 1928-1929, and the resulting number of unemployed, is held by some to have helped the communistic propaganda. *Catalonia* is, however, their most active area where they have had many alternate successes and defeats. The province is both agricultural and industrial, has a fertile soil and numerous mines, and unfortunately has hitherto been susceptible to communist propaganda. Barcelona is really the metropolis of the anarchist societies. The numerous frays between their many divisions have often dyed with blood the streets of that beautiful city. It can hardly fail of being their future battle-ground, though assuredly it deserves a better fate!

If we seek to know the attitude of the general public

on the question, the answer is not far to seek. But a different matter entirely is how the Government envisages the problem. The actual rulers of the nation affect atheism, or rather anti-catholicism; that is to say, they are sectarian. The nation itself is Catholic—more so perhaps than even before—and public opinion unanimously condemns Communism, and likewise most of the legislation of the Cabinet Azaña and its Cortes. The Government strives to cajole the Catholics with promises, and the communists with toleration of their activities. It is not in itself communistic but composed largely of Freemasons, Jews, and Demagogues. The present governmental programme was mapped out several years ago in the "*lodges*" before the Republic came into existence. In the writer's view Freemasonry and Communism may be in secret alliance and not without a common financial support from the Jewish element.

The country is therefore in a period of transition fraught with peril. Possibly the Communists may succeed in fomenting a social upheaval, but it can be borne in mind that the valiant Captains of the Peninsula fought never more bravely than in the presence of danger, and their race is still as numerous as of yore among the sunny hills of Spain.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. P. DE TERNANT.

Fourth Sunday after Pentecost.

(Luke v. 1-11.)

The conversion and salvation of each soul is an individual matter. "No man can come to me unless my Father draw him." But this Parable refers particularly to the *wholesale aspect* of the Church's work on earth—the gathering in of the masses, of whole races. Let us look at the Church as an organism, or living body, in the world at large.

If statistics were not a little boring to some people one might reel off lists of figures. But it may be news to some that there are over three hundred millions of Catholics in the world. The Pope has an army of Bishops and legions of priests at his command. Let us raise our eyes and look beyond the confines of the parish at the stupendous spectacle of the Church in the world. Is there anything like it? No. Has there ever been anything like it? No; the same thing in substance always has been the most outstanding fact in history since the time of the Roman Persecutions, which ended up by the Roman Emperor professing himself a Catholic, and accepting his crown from the Pope. The Roman Empire itself was swept into the net of the Fisherman less than three hundred years after the Prophecy of Christ to Peter. The history of Europe for the next 1,200 years was practically the history of Catholicism. Catholic Bishops and priests, under the direction of the everlasting Papacy, civilized our rude forefathers here and all over Europe.

Here is an example which may come home to us. The invasions of the pirate Northmen nearly put an end to settled life in these islands and elsewhere. They were so savage that war against them was unsuccessful. The expedient of buying them off with money only made them come back for more. St. Ansgar went north, penetrated their strongholds, and converted them to Catholicism. The devastation ceased, and the Scandinavian peoples became for a long time a shining example, and produced many Saints.

The missionary work of the Church at the time of the Reformation, as it is called, is far more interesting than the sordid tale with which we are only too familiar. The religious Orders literally swarmed over Africa, America, and Asia as far as China and Japan. It reads like a novel, only better because it is true.

To-day this work of the Church continues, and is one of the wonders of the world. Whole races of people whom we may never have heard of, and whom we may be inclined to lump

together as "savages," are actually more advanced in Catholic knowledge and Catholic practice than many of us. The net is being widely cast; the Fisherman is still at work, carrying out Our Lord's command.

The present writer once had the pleasant experience of converting an Anglican by means of a single sermon on Catholic Missions. He said: "Well, Father, I never knew all that before. If that's the case I had better join the Real Thing." He made an excellent Catholic. This convert realized as a business man—he was a wholesale coal-merchant—that the Big Firm, properly managed, can always override any number of detached private enterprises. In commerce the Big Firm is not always an unmixed blessing. But in the matter of religion it is God's plan. Such a plan, of course, involves unified control and a single supreme authority. This much was dimly recognized during the War. People who had never shown any consideration of the Papacy suddenly asked, in despair, "Why does not the Pope stop the War?" Alas, the Pope does not obtain universal obedience. Otherwise the War would never have started. If the advice of Leo XIII forty years ago had been attended to, the evils which led to the War would not have gathered to a head. To-day, once again, the Pope is proclaiming to the world the truth that the cure for the economic evils of the day is a moral one. The world may yet owe its salvation to the Papacy. But at present people do not care to take advice from a Pope; therefore they must suffer.

Yet let us note that a group of twenty-six of our own M.P.s, twenty-five of them being non-Catholics, have paid an official visit to the Holy Father, a few weeks ago. May this be a sign of the times! The Fisherman is still at work, casting his net, at Christ's bidding. Let us at least improve our own knowledge of the Papacy and its working. Considerations like these ought to stir our blood. Once the will is moved action is sure to follow, along the various paths which God will point out to each one of us.

Fifth Sunday after Pentecost.

(Matthew v. 20-24.)

1. Our Lord draws a contrast between the rather stern outlook of the Old Law, which dealt much with crimes, and the new outlook of the Gospel Virtues. Sin was rather a physical matter with the Jews; among us a greater account is made of spiritual sins. In the present case He lays down some Evangelical notions of personal charity. We are introduced not only to precepts but also to counsels of perfection.

Under the Old Dispensation the crime of murder was severely punished, according to the circumstances of the case. Our Lord lays down that even anger can bring a person into great danger before the judgment bar of God. By this we do not imply that anger is always or necessarily a mortal sin. But there is great

danger that it may be so. Let us then beware, without becoming scrupulous.

Our Lord now discusses three degrees of anger, estimated according to their expression in speech.

(a) To be angry is dangerous. (b) To use abusive expressions will cause us to be closely examined in the light of God's justice, just as certain kinds of offenders were examined by one of the Jewish tribunals. (c) The strongest of all expressions of uncharity, uttered in anger is easily capable of involving a mortal sin. What is this expression? The word is not our English word "fool." It was a dreadful curse, implying "You have denied the God of our fathers, and He has abandoned you"—a very different thing. Among people who had a vivid notion of God's immediate presence this was very dreadful. We can see that of its nature it must be a mortal sin, if uttered to gratify private hate.

2. To say, with conviction, that a person is a "perfect fool" is not in itself a grievous sin. It might be a sad lapse from charity, even if it were true. But it might be permissible, in serious discussion over the rights or wrongs of some matter. It has its uses and misuses. Children call each other "silly fool!" This implies unpleasant features in a child's mind. If not checked they may lead to unpleasant results. But one can quote the case of a Catholic teacher reproving a child, not on the grounds suggested, but on the strength of the text, quoting Our Lord's own words. This was wrong.

3. We are not bound by all the legalism of the Jews, and not at all by the killing formalism of the Pharisees. We interpret moral questions by a spiritual light. And this light is indicated by the word "intention." Sin, then, is not so much a matter of words as of spirit. Here are few practical examples of the use of this injurious word in the English sense. A father may tell his son, more in sorrow than in anger, *not to act like a fool*. The reproach may be well-founded. If so, who shall say that the father has not authority to pronounce it? Perhaps certain modern sons! A person may tell his most intimate friend, whom he sees making a sad mistake through passion, sentiment, error or obstinacy, his frank opinion, and enforce that opinion with an appeal to this word. If the grounds are good and it is done with evident sincerity, this may even be an act of charity. We must use discretion.

For children to get into the way of using the word as if it were quite harmless involves carelessness of others' feelings, rough and ready judgment of an unfavourable kind, censoriousness, foolish confidence in one's own superiority, and other things of the kind. But let us not cure these faults by a violent application of the text. It was not meant for that.

4. But where this word or similar ones, even in English, can directly involve mortal sin is when they are seriously intended and are the outcome of an explosion of self-love. Someone has

contradicted us, thwarted us, insulted us, injured us. Here we come to the great precepts of Christian Charity to which Our Lord passes in the second half of His instruction. We cannot attempt to mention all the possible kinds and degrees of quarrel which arise. But when they arise let us first preserve calm, even when we feel that all the wrong is on the other side. "The anger of man worketh not the justice of God." As to revenge, let the thought of it be put far away! "'Vengeance is *Mine*,' saith the Lord; 'I will repay.'" It is wrong for us as private persons to encroach on such a terrible prerogative of God, which requires divine wisdom for its proper exercise. (In various states of life we are called on to pronounce judgment and inflict penalties, officially. But the instruction refers to private individuals.) Let us have patience. "Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small." The providence of God works in wonderful ways. We must not impede it by our own precipitancy.

5. In the meantime we must do all we can to promote reconciliation. Can we say that Our Lord's precept concerning the gift and the altar is put in the form of an oriental figure of speech, which it is impossible to observe literally? Granted that it were, let us leave the expression in its highest form, obey the spirit of it in its highest degree, and carry it out as far as the case will permit. If we see the other party at all willing to make a step let us at once make two. We must examine the whole case carefully with the help of the best advice. (Beware of any but the best!) We must repair or offer to repair whatever may be wrong on our side. We must not insist on every item of justice which may be due to us, for we may owe more in charity than is owed to us in justice.

If, however, the rights of others are involved along with ours we are not called upon to be quite so generous. Neither are we in any case called upon to play into the hands of designing people or make ourselves a doormat for other people's dirty boots. For the Gospel virtues are bound up with common sense. If we only developed their spirit properly it would raise what is called *sound worldly wisdom* to a higher level.

If all efforts fail, then we must keep apart. We have to be ready to help our enemies, should they need our help. At the least, we should pray for them.

6. Let us speak quite frankly. Catholics from the Continent sometimes gain an impression that our ideas of mortal sin are mostly connected with the sixth commandment. The term "immorality" has acquired a standard meaning. Some minds among us seem to be rather dull to the possibility of serious sins of uncharity, and this, too, especially in the atmosphere of Catholic life. One can bring to mind extremely uncharitable individuals who are preoccupied with various phases of religion.

Our Lord commenced His instruction with a reference to murder, no less. We will end our commentary with a reference

to jealousy, vanity and independence, no more. From these three causes fierce quarrels arise, among good people. Here are large questions, but they arise from to-day's gospel. Let us examine them closely, and make them a matter of conscience.

Sixth Sunday after Pentecost.

(Mark viii. 1-9.)

These "Gospels," or extracts from the Gospels, are not intended by the Church to stand alone week by week. If we read only the headlines in the newspapers we may be able to talk about the news, but we can have very little understanding of it. Is it not rather annoying, after we have read an article carefully, to meet a person who raises the subject, but who, we find, has read no more than the posters and the headlines? We feel that he is "making it up as he goes along," while we have a pretty good mastery of the question. These "Gospels," then, are more than weekly headlines of doctrine. We ought to read beyond them. The Church does not say "start here," or "stop here." Time is limited on a Sunday morning, and the Church indicates to us a point on which to base our considerations. We should do this in our own time. One of the reasons for Sunday observance is to give us an opportunity of doing so.

To-day's Gospel, to be understood, must be read in connection with other passages, both in the New Testament and in the Old. Let us take the latter first. We may seem to start far away from the point, but we shall soon come round to it.

When the Lord spoke to the Prophets of old, entrusting them with a message, He usually described certain symbolic actions which they were to perform. These would arouse curiosity, and give point to the message. Thus in *Ezekiel* iv. 1, we read: "Take thee a tile, and lay it before thee: and draw on it the plan of the city of Jerusalem. 2. And lay siege against it, and built forts, and cast up a mount, and set a camp against it, and place battering-rams round about it. 3. And take unto thee an iron pan, and set it for a wall of iron between thee and the city; and set thy face resolutely against it, and it shall be besieged, and thou shalt lay siege against it: it is a sign to the house of Israel. . . . 7. And thou shalt turn thy face to (indicate) the siege of Jerusalem, and thy arm shall be stretched out: and thou shalt prophesy against it."

This style of doing things was deeply engrained in the habits of the Jews. They used it habitually of their own accord, even without divine instructions. Thus in *Kings* iv. 15: "And Eliseus said to him (Joas): 'Bring a bow and arrows.' And when he had brought him a bow and arrows, he said to the King of Israel . . . 'Open the window to the east.' And when he had opened it, Eliseus said: 'Shoot an arrow.' And he shot. And Eliseus said: 'The arrow of the Lord's deliverance, and the arrow of the deliverance from Syria: and thou shalt strike the Syrians in Aphec, till thou consume them.'" The tearing of

one's garments, to signify grief or protestation (the rent not being sewn up, but preserved as a testimony), and the casting of a shoe to signify possession (which still remains with us!) are similar instances.

Now we begin to come to the point. Our Lord was born of the Jewish race. His blessed Mother was a Jewess. This is a fact of history, in spite of the efforts of devout artists to represent her as a flaxen-haired Teutonic maid, or a Spanish or Italian madonna. (Here, by the way, is a reason why we should detest anti-Jewish demonstrations. They are contrary to Christian charity, and to natural justice. But they are also an insult to the race of whom Our Lord deigned to be born on earth, whose customs He followed, and over whom He wept.) Our Lord was a Jew, in His human nature. He spoke in Jewish style and followed Hebrew customs. This feeding of the thousands was a symbolic act, such as we have been describing. It was immediately connected with a discourse on the Bread of Life, which the Church interprets, in its most important part, as referring to the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament.

The miracle was performed at least twice, once when about 4,000 were fed and seven baskets were left over (Mark viii.), another time when about 5,000 were fed and twelve baskets remained (John vi.). The meaning of all this is explained in the wonderful sixth chapter of St. John, which is recommended to you to-day for your Sunday reading. It is a later account of the same thing, written for the benefit of the Christians of some sixty years later, by the one man really qualified to give the intimate spiritual interpretation of Our Lord's words and actions—for St. John was His beloved disciple, who leaned on His breast at the Last Supper.

Having distributed the food, Our Lord spoke on the Bread of Life which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life to the world (v. 33). The early part of the discourse can possibly be understood in a general sense, as referring to the life conferred by the new Revelation, the Redemption, Grace, and all the doctrines connected with these mysteries. But Our Lord soon became more explicit. "The Bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The Jews began to argue in a grumbling or heckling spirit, asking how this man could give His own flesh to be eaten? "Then Jesus said to them. . . ." (Quote or paraphrase vv. 54-59 inclusive.)

To what else can this refer if not to the Blessed Sacrament? To its life-giving power, its multiplication as symbolized by the miracle, and the performance of the miracle itself lest the people should faint by the way?

It was now the turn of some of the disciples themselves to stumble. "This saying is hard, and who can bear it?" Here is the parting of the ways. Our Lord appealed to the divinity of His Father and to the proof of His own divinity which was to be unfolded to them. But their intelligence was gross.

They had no spiritual instinct, like many of the early Protestants who denied the meaning which Christians had given these words for centuries past. Luther himself maintained the traditional meaning some ten years after he had broken with the Pope. He scrawled the words "*Hoc est corpus meum*" in chalk round the council table when his colleagues were trying to get the figurative meaning adopted officially by the Protestant movement.

Nowadays a large and growing body of Protestants, the High Anglicans, are maintaining the literal meaning just as we are, although they do not acknowledge the authority of the Pope or of the Council of Trent. Their own private interpretation forces them to take the matter thus. And they know that there was little or no dispute over the Real Presence for fifteen hundred years, although practically every other part of Christian doctrine was discussed and defined (because of disputes) in General Councils. Unfortunately they have lost Apostolic succession in their ordinations, and therefore cannot consecrate validly, though they believe they can.

Let us, then, take our part. For "after this," that is, after Our Lord's appeal to their faith in Him and His words, "many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him."

We will not wander in the wilderness of our own conjectures or the chaos of other people's opinions, but answer with St. Peter: "To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

It would seem as if to-day's sermon has wandered a little from the gospel of the day into another portion of the Gospel. But that is the very point we agreed on at the outset—that the Sunday Gospels are closely connected, some of them inseparably so. If we wish to understand the symbolism of the miracle here recorded we must go to St. John. Once we have done that we can dwell upon many striking things in to-day's gospel—Our Lord's kindness, fore-thought, creative power, command over the visible world. Without the completer version of St. John all this might appear as beautiful, poetic, touching, fit to move our devotion. But with the explanation it all takes on a deeper character, fit to capture our faith. The miracle stands out as a carefully chosen symbol of Our Lord's fore-thought, kindness and creative power in the world of grace, of His kingship of the invisible world.

It is no longer a temporal mercy shown to His disciples on a certain day by the edge of the lake; it is a revelation of His designs for all Christians, for ever, in sight of the sea of eternal life, by means of the Blessed Sacrament.

Seventh Sunday after Pentecost.

(Matt. vii. 15-21.)

The word "prophet" is commonly understood to mean a person who foretells events. But its more general meaning—

often found in Scripture—is that of a person who speaks publicly, or makes pronouncement. The syllable “pro” may mean “before” in order of time, or “forth,” in the sense of “speaking out.” A prophet, then, is a person who claims to make a revelation. He claims to be the messenger of God and the interpreter of His will.

1. Religion has a natural attraction for humanity, God having made us what we are. It is a great temptation for a person of weak or unbalanced mind to stand forth as a religious prophet. It also happens when people are strong-minded. Such self-appointed “announcers” have always abounded, and always will. Our Lord utters a salutary warning, as needful in our days as in the days of old.

2. Every heresy contains an element of truth. That is its starting-point; the rest is human invention. By means of the element of truth the false prophet obtains a hearing, and on the strength of that proceeds to elaborate the rest—suppressing true things, insinuating false ones, taking a lot for granted, and involving clear things in obscurity. His examples, his arguments, his appeals to emotion are so many decoy-ducks, which the attract the curious and incautious. Thus he maintains a reputation and perhaps makes a living until someone else comes along with a better bag of tricks and steals his crowd. This is a description of the lower type of false religious prophet.

But there are many forms of false religion now established all around us whose leaders and followers can claim respectability. They repeat what they learned in their youth, and really believe what they teach. If we look round we see that a great part of the world is under the sway of teachers whose doctrine differs very much from ours. Many, perhaps most, of them are quite sincere. What, then, one may ask, does it matter? The idea that it does not matter is part of the error itself. True, we are not called on to judge individuals. The Gospel bids us look at the whole thing. What we see to-day is the outcome of the work of false prophets in the past.

3. If we invited to tea a leading High Anglican, an eminent Baptist (seating these two side by side!), a popular Congregationalist preacher, a Wesleyan and a Salvationist, and asked them to join in a message or “prophecy” to the world announcing (a) *What one should believe*, (b) *What one should do*, to feel sure that one was standing in God’s favour—I leave the result to your imagination.

Here, then, is the main difference between the fruit of the good tree of Christian unity based on Christ’s authority, and the fruit of the bad tree of anything else. False prophets announced the beginnings of these different groups of Christians. But the legitimate authorized announcers are the Catholic Bishops and clergy, who hold commissions handed down from the apostles, who received them from Our Lord Himself.

All around us is division, separating the very marrow from

the bone in the Christian body. All within the Catholic Church is unity, security, steadiness and organic life.

One admits that there have been fights and disputes among Catholics. But these were incidental; the unity is substantial and has always prevailed. On the other hand, if we seek for anything in common among the various "bodies" outside we have to whittle things down, and take refuge in vague phrases and empty resolutions, until we come to the mere common term *Christianity*. And our friends at the tea-party would find it hard to agree on a common definition of that much.

4. There is only one Fold and one Shepherd, one Revelation, with all its parts, one Authority, one system of Sacramental Grace. The note of the Church of Christ is unity. The fruit of the evil tree called "forms of religion" is disunity. How much better the plan of God would have been realized if the forefathers of all these good people had not been led astray by false prophets, and set up standards of error which now pass, in a vague way, for the good fruits of the Tree of Life!

Eighth Sunday after Pentecost.

(Luke xvii. 1-9.)

The parable of the Unjust Steward is perhaps one of the best-known. Among the "short stories" that Our Lord propounded to convey moral truths this is one of the finest, as a story, in its compression and the dramatic march of its incidents. Yet one finds that it is not always well understood. It may even be said that some people appreciate the story better than the moral.

There are two points which call for close explanation to enable us to understand the story quite clearly. Thus we shall appreciate the moral still more. We will deal with these two at once.

(a) "And the lord commended the unjust steward forasmuch as he had done wisely." Uninstructed people have been met with who have obtained from this sentence an impression that Our Lord Himself in some mysterious way condoned the fraud. The meaning is "And the rich man said"—possibly with a chuckle—"that the steward was a scamp, but at any rate a clever one." This we can quite understand. When we read the details of some gigantic fraud, we can hardly help, from the purely human point of view, expressing a kind of sporting interest in the astuteness of the criminal. His "cheek" takes our breath away, and—such is our human nature—we cannot always keep back an expression of admiration, though we regret the sin and its consequences. The lord of the estate did not, in the proper sense of the word, praise the unjust steward, nor did he praise the unjust acts. He only "gave him points for the manner in which he had got away with it." That is the meaning in plain English. Observe that *the lord* is not Our Lord, but the rich man in the story. This is not a condonation of the sin by

Christ, as He tells the story. It is rather one of those human touches which He knew so well how to introduce, and which serve the purpose of bringing the stories right home to us. The moral and spiritual conclusions are above the general run of our thoughts, and are intended to elevate us. But the stories in which He set these truths are carved solid out of humanity itself.

2. "Make to yourselves friends of the Mammon of iniquity." Mammon was a Carthaginian word, foreign to the Jews. It meant riches, worldly riches, the profits of trade, or conquest. "Mammon of iniquity" conveys the idea that worldly riches, if not necessarily evil, are at any rate closely bound up with the idea of evil. "How hardly shall a rich man enter into the Kingdom of Heaven!" This evil may arise in two ways.

(a) *In the origin of riches.* Have they come from fraud, rapacity, oppression? Has one gained one's advantages at the expense of one's fellow-creatures? This, under many aspects, is a great question of the day. Let us, however, remember that a good many people who complain of social injustices and raise agitations do so merely as a cloak for coveting their neighbour's goods.

(b) *In the consequence of riches.* Assuming that riches are fairly and honestly held, does not their possession very often involve self-indulgence? Money was a means of sin in those days, and still is. For every Joseph of Arimathea who could afford to have a private tomb and bestow it on Our Lord there have been hundreds of rich men whose souls were ruined or led on the road to ruin by wealth.

But we must not indulge in diatribes against the millionaires. The principle runs throughout society. A man earning three pounds a week is a rich man compared with a match-seller, and can ruin his soul quite easily by spending forty shillings of his wages on the gratification of his desires.

3. Several meanings appear to be compressed into the concluding words of the parable, and have exercised the ingenuity of the commentators. We can for the present rest satisfied with the general meaning that money, which to many people is an occasion of sin, may by the exercise of Christian virtue be an instrument of good, even of eternal blessing. This thing, wealth (even relative wealth, as when a child is promoted from twopence a week pocket-money to sixpence a week), often comes before us in the guise of an enemy. Yet we can master it and press it into the service of God. It becomes a friend, and helps us to save our soul. This is one of the *paradoxes*, or unexpected things, of Christianity—that by means of spiritual power we can take hold of unpromising things and, without changing their nature, change their effects.

This doctrine must have come as a surprise to the people to whom Our Lord spoke, among whom a trader and a tax-gatherer were practically the same thing as a person versed in

the arts of corruption. But to *us* does it not come as a novelty that riches can be used for some other purpose than merely having a good time here on earth? A couple of months ago many of us enjoyed some very pleasant day-dreams concerning what we would do if had good luck in a certain drawing of tickets. What was the material of those dreams? A question to be asked.

Ten good shillings went in the purchase of a ticket, without a pang. Was not the chance worth the price? And yet when we are told that the purposes of religion require a certain sum to be raised in order that a church can be built, where Mass can be offered in a worthy setting, the Sacraments obtained, and the Gospel preached, and which may be a rallying-point in the work of the conversion of England—we understand that sixpence a head all round for a few weeks would see the matter through—we scrape round in our pocket for a penny. No particular reproach is intended. This is a common fact. Let us admit, on behalf of the clergy, that appeals are frequent, perhaps monotonous. But will the Faithful admit, on the other hand, that the appeals of the posters, the advertisements, the shop-windows, and our own desires, are even more frequent, and are attended to with a good deal of sympathy?

There is, of course, much generosity. But people are still very numerous who look on money as merely a means of having a good time in this world. What we spent on ourselves was mostly lost. What we spent in the service of God and in charity has become an eternal possession.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. PHILOSOPHY.

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Several biographies of great Catholic philosophers have appeared recently, some of which will appeal to the general reader while others will interest only a smaller circle. Of them all, the small volume, *St. Thomas Aquinas and His Work*,¹ from the pen of Père Sertillanges, will probably find the widest acceptance. The book is well, though freely, translated by Fr. Anstruther, O.P. In it we get an impression of St. Thomas the man—big, silent, gentle, tranquil, remote, with a strong southern temperament mightily controlled—a man dwelling on the mountain tops, but a real man; and this is a valuable impression as a complement to the usual one of the almost abstract figure of the Angel of the Schools.

But every reader of Père Sertillanges will know that there must be much more than this. The background of St. Thomas's teaching is described: the epoch in which Greek thought was introduced to the West, when Aristotle was variously considered as a candidate for baptism or as a victim for the stake, when the mendicant orders were fighting for their existence as teachers in Paris. Of St. Thomas's share in their victory Père Sertillanges gives the usual account which, as we shall see presently, is rejected by a still more recent authority. The occasions of his different works are indicated. The task before St. Thomas was "to establish the mutual relations of Faith and reason" (p. 26), "to insist on the autonomy and independence of both Faith and reason, to give each its rights and allow each to develop according to its own laws" (p. 37).

There has been much discussion lately as to St. Augustine's title to be called a philosopher. But even those who would say that his works are formally theological to the exclusion of pure philosophy must allow that these works are charged throughout with philosophic thought and have been an inspiration to the great scholastics. An interesting and instructive article, by F. van Steenberghen, in the current *Revue Néo-Scholastique* is devoted to a criticism of the views of M. Gilson and others on this matter, and to the preliminary question as to whether or not there is such a thing as a "Christian philosophy." The author is in close accord with the view of M. Maritain and is opposed to that of M. Gilson. The discussion is rather a matter of terminology, but that does not mean that it is insignificant.

Allowing then that St. Augustine is one of the great

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. pp. 150+ix.

philosophers, we may perhaps consider here his latest biography by Miss Rebecca West,² far removed though it be from formal philosophy. It is one of a series so ample in its scope as to advertise "Lenin," "St. Paul," and "Queen Elizabeth" in juxtaposition. One reader at least turned to the book with eager curiosity, feeling that here was a subject worthy of Miss Rebecca West's talent. But it is an opportunity which, to my mind, she has wholly failed to grasp and I was grievously disappointed. She has, it is true, presented a fascinating picture of the times and an interesting study of Augustine; but the result reminds me of the sub-title "A Novel Without a Hero," for her Augustine is certainly no hero, and though he is the son of Patricius and Monica, and is the author of "The City of God" and is the Bishop of Hippo, I refuse to believe that he is the real St. Augustine. In the first part of the book Miss West is concerned very properly with the investigation of the saint's psychology, but she is so anxious to *explain* him, and is so preoccupied with the New Psychology, that she seems to have been (of course, unconsciously) determined to fit the facts into her theory. The process becomes fatiguing, even irritating. St. Monica is represented as the strong, sensible, capable woman, whose very perfections justified or, at least, extenuated, her husband's irascibility, and whose jealous love of Augustine was responsible for what Miss West considers to be some of his worst features. His lack of sympathy with Patricius's difficulties "can only be explained by his love for his mother Monica which was so strong that he was bound to hate anyone who had a competing claim on her." "With her smooth competence she must have been able to make the Church a most alluring prospect for one who with his dislike of his father, and his addiction to unsparing self-criticism, must have hated violence almost as urgently as his pride recommended it to him."

"Though Augustine was a saint and a genius and a most loveable child of earth, he was often not a gentleman." I fail to see in *this* book any evidence that Augustine was a saint; but there is a rather strong tradition to that effect, and Miss West bows to it here in spite of her earlier remark: "This fundamental determination to take and not to give explains why he never performed any action during his seventy-six years which could possibly be held up as a pattern for ethical imitation." That he was a child of earth is made clear enough, but except in so far as every child of earth may be loveable for his very earthiness, I see here no evidence of Augustine's amiability; but once again there are his friends and their testimony, and Miss West accepts it. But nobody ever said that he was a "gentleman." I wonder why! Was it because this, like so many other of Miss West's quite modern standards of comparison, was unknown sixteen hundred years ago, and that therefore it is futile to try to appraise St. Augustine by such measures? I

² *St. Augustine*. Peter Davis. 5s. pp. 74.

believe that Miss West does like St. Augustine, but it seems to me that she has tried and failed to synthesize the details of evidence as to his character, and that she has given us a synthetic Augustine as different from the real (and traditional) man as synthetic products usually are from their prototypes.

In these busy days of many books the dialogue form in serious work is not very attractive. We expect our books to get to the point and having got there to keep there. We dislike the asides, the penumbra of the conversational method. But the device is almost as old as formal philosophy, and in philosophy the conversational method is often very useful. It is in the interchange and discussion of opinions that progress is made. And from the lips of M. Maritain we shall get no mere padding of the theme. There is practically no waste of words in the conversations between Pentonous and Theonas in which the author, as Neo-Hylas, joins: enquiry leads to explanation, objection to clarifying reply.³ The conversations range over a wide area, and deal with subjects more or less fundamental. In the first chapter on the Freedom of the Intellect, Neo-Hylas explains in an all-important "parenthesis," the act of knowing: "the action (of the intellect) is altogether *immanent*" and "secondly, in this vital operation of knowing our intelligence is *dependent* upon some object not itself." In dealing with Aristotle's conception of the "superman," he explains the true nature of contemplation, and in a few words gives the key to the solution of the difficult problem of distinguishing between the contemplation of the mere philosopher and that of the Christian mystic.

Perhaps the most valuable section of the book is that devoted to the "Mathematical Attenuation of Time." Here M. Maritain is reverting to a topic which he has treated before. But it is well worth doing again. I am not sure that the reader altogether unacquainted with Einstein's work (if there be any such reader to-day) will be able to follow the argument satisfactorily; but a very slight acquaintance with the literature will enable him to see the justice of the final contention, viz., that in these mathematical abstractions there is no ontological counterpart: Mathematical Physics "manifests a capacity for generalization, a rich fertility in discovery: it can stimulate thought to feverish activity. These powers it has, and the less it bothers about pinning down its symbols upon natures and causes really existent in the world, the more marvellously are its powers manifested; but that obviously means renunciation of contact with the real in everything save the starting points of its experiments and the agreement of its numerical results" (p. 100).

A very laudatory, but a justly laudatory, article in the last number of the *Revue Thomiste* (Mars-Avril) analyses the recent works of M. Maritain—"La souveraineté de Maritain réside en ceci: dégager d'un objet quel qu'il soit—je ne dis pas tout

³ *Theonas*, by Jacques Maritain, translated by J. F. Sheed. Sheed & Ward. 6s. pp. 200+viii.

l'intelligible, même *quoad nos*—mais ce qu'il y a de fondamental, de central, de perenniel dans cet intelligible, atteindre d'un seul élan (en vertu d'un *ontotropisme* extraordinairement positif) le noeud vital des essences sans papillonner obscurément dans la zone attractive des contingences extérieures et des apparences périphériques." The "*ontotropisme* extraordinairement positif" is very apt. The works reviewed are (1) An article in the *Revue Néo-Scholastique* "*De la notion de la philosophie chrétienne*" (in the abstract there is no more a Christian philosophy than there is a Christian mathematics or biology, but in the concrete there is a Christian philosophy); (2) "*Le songe de Descartes*," in which Maritain discusses the philosophy which is the parent of idealist subjectivism, of rationalism, and of cartesian dualism; and (3) *Les Degrés de Savoir*, to which Maritain refers in the preface to *Theonas* as a fuller exposition of the line of thought found in this new work. *Le Songe de Descartes* is considered by the French reviewer (G. Thibon) to be "l'oeuvre la plus ample, la plus forte, la plus lucide de Maritain," a volume which "doit être salué comme un des événements majeurs de l'histoire contemporaine."

In the same issue of the *Revue Thomiste* Père Garrigou-Lagrange has a brief but very clear exposition of the idea of personality: "Le constitutif formel (de la personnalité)," he writes, "ne peut donc être ni la nature individuelle, ni l'existence, ni la conscience, ni la liberté. C'est ce qui constitue le sujet premier d'attribution comme sujet (*suppositum*); on l'appelle en latin 'subsistent' et chez les êtres doués de raison 'personnalité.'"

A timely volume, *St. Albert le Grand*, appears in the *Collection Temps et Visages*.⁴ It is a closely written historical account of St. Albert's life and work as student, lecturer, superior and bishop. There is a preface by Père Mandonnet, whose authority is subsequently quoted for the statement that it was St. Albert, and not St. Thomas, who represented his order at Anagni and defended them against the attacks on the Mendicants in Paris. St. Thomas's "*Contra impugnantes*" was written in 1257 two years later than the offending work of Guillaume de Saint Amour, "*On a Danger of Modern Times*." As I have noted above, in reviewing *St. Thomas Aquinas and His Work*, St. Thomas gets the credit of it, as indeed he usually does.

In an illuminating article which has pride of place in the last number of the *Revue Néo-Scholastique* Fr. Raeymaker shows that St. Albert the Great was a pioneer in vindicating for philosophy its autonomous character. The author also sets out clearly St. Albert's principal philosophical theses and shows how St. Thomas accepted or modified them. He treats of intellectual knowledge, the transcendentals, the composition of corporeal beings, causality, etc.

⁴ Desclée de Brouer et Cie.

II. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

Two "Bakerist" books deserve the place of honour this month, because anyone who has once made the acquaintance of Fr. Baker will not readily abandon him. He is for us a master of the spiritual life, distinguished for the liberality and wisdom of his guidance. The books are *The Life of Fr. Augustine Baker, O.S.B.*, by Fr. Peter Salvin and Fr. Serenus Cressy,¹ and *Prayer and Holiness*, by Dom B. Weld-Blundell.² The Life is really two lives. The authors were devoted disciples of Fr. Baker. Fr. Salvin's account is rather an appreciation than a strict biography, and is more readable than the other life; it is stamped with the writer's distinctive qualities of candour, simplicity and devotion. Only one manuscript of it exists and this was lost to sight from the French Revolution until the present time.³ Fr. Cressy's life, on the contrary, has been known all along in several manuscripts. It is more definitely a biography than Salvin's and gives an excellent account of Fr. Baker's spiritual life and teaching. The editor has collated the various manuscripts of this life with scrupulous care, and he has modernized the spelling and punctuation of both lives.

Fr. Cressy is very well known to readers of Fr. Baker as the compiler of *Sancta Sophia*, called *Holy Wisdom* in its recent editions. That work is a faithful digest of Fr. Baker's teaching, but Dom McCann wonders if, as a whole, it conveys a true impression of his mind. It is an elaborately systematized manual, while Fr. Baker himself was no great believer in methods and systems. "His single aim was to put souls in the way of interior prayer, and the practice of that prayer seemed to him all that mattered. So his treatises are suggestive and persuasive, rather than demonstrative. They are of the nature of improvisations and they tend to lack any severe logical form. To reduce them to such a form was necessarily to some extent a procrustean achievement, and was bound to mar their fresh spontaneity and to alter their temper."⁴ He passed a similar criticism two years ago when writing of the controversy that Fr. Baker's teaching aroused at Douay and continued long afterwards to arouse.⁵ Dom McCann would,

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xl., 216. 6s. It is edited by Dom Justin McCann, O.S.B.

² Magnani. pp. xx., 95. 3s. 6d.

³ The MSS. is called *Quadrilogus, or a Collection of Four Treatises concerning the Life and Writings of the Ven. Father, Fr. Augustine Baker*, etc. It contains the lives by Salvin and Cressy, Fr. Baker's rhymes and unfinished autobiography, and Fr. Leander Prichard's life of Fr. Baker. The latter two treatises are being printed by the Catholic Record Society in their forthcoming volume (33). The whole MSS. will then be in print.

⁴ Preface to the present Life, p. xvi.

⁵ "Bakerism" at Douay Seminary, in *CLERGY REVIEW*, September, 1931. See p. 226.

therefore, like to see the full works in print. Readers could then attain his true mind. Such an edition in French is apparently on the way, but has been delayed in its very early stages by the death of its editor, Dom Maurice Noetinger of Solesmes, the well-known authority on the English Mystics. It is doubtful, however, if any but students of the history of spirituality would work through Fr. Baker's actual writings; they are too prolix, and *Holy Wisdom* is too good a substitute.

Even *Holy Wisdom* is too tedious and in style too antiquated for many readers, and they welcome the late Dom Benedict Weld-Blundell's modernized versions. He condensed and re-wrote the whole, omitting entirely thirteen chapters, in 1907 and called his work *Contemplative Prayer*, and at the same time published separately, under the title *Patterns of Devout Exercises*, the scheme of Acts and Affections that form an appendix to *Holy Wisdom*. Twenty years later Dom Benedict began to re-edit his recension in sections, with slight modifications and fewer omissions. He published *Contemplative Prayer*, Volume I, in 1927. It comprises the first treatise of *Holy Wisdom*, on the interior life in general. In 1931 he produced *Self-Discipline and Holiness*, covering the second treatise of *Holy Wisdom*, on mortification.⁶ The same year he published a revised edition of *Patterns of Devout Exercises*, calling it *Acts and Affections for Mental Prayer*.⁷ This year a disciple of Dom Benedict has brought out *Prayer and Holiness*, mentioned at the beginning of these notes. From its Preface, it is clear that it was meant to cover the whole of the third treatise of *Holy Wisdom*, on Prayer, and so complete the re-edition of the original *Contemplative Prayer*; but, in fact, it stops short at the end of the second of the four sections of the treatise and so deals only with prayer in general and with meditation. This is unfortunate, since the remaining two sections of *Holy Wisdom*, especially the section on affective prayer, are particularly good. But the work, as far as it goes, is of equal merit with all Dom Benedict's modern versions of Baker; and, in its imperfect state, it has the advantage of presenting Fr. Baker's teaching on meditation unobscured by the brilliancy of his doctrine of affective prayer and contemplation. But for those who do not mind an old-fashioned English style, *Holy Wisdom* itself is naturally superior to modernized renderings of it.

*On Paths of Holiness*⁸ is a new kind of book on the spirit and activity of the priesthood. "This little book," says the author, "aims to portray the life of the secular priest as it is. Hence it purposely abandons all those schematic outlines within which the life of the Catholic priest is ordinarily sketched.

⁶ For a short notice of it, see CLERGY REVIEW, June, 1931, p. 630.

⁷ For a notice of it, see CLERGY REVIEW, September, 1931, p. 270.

⁸ Herder, pp. vi., 343. 10s. 6d. Adapted from the German of Rev. Karl Eder, S.T.D., by Rev. Frank Gerein, B.A., S.T.D.

The author desires to show the priest as he is in actual life, not idealized; and therefore he does not lift him out of his environment, but leaves him where God and his exalted vocation have placed him." He is dealing only with the secular priest. The book is a series of fifty essays, mostly short ones; in them every aspect of the priest's character, life and mission seems to be at least touched upon. Some of the essays are exceptionally good (v.g., XXIX, *The Training of the Priest*), and there is scarcely one from which the reader does not glean many wise, helpful thoughts. And from the book as a whole, you do indeed gather an image, finely portrayed, of the ideal priest in his natural surroundings, of the sort of priest that God evidently wants, for He has in fact scattered him broadcast throughout His Church. Such a priest is a man of real learning, sane and skilled in judgment, kindly and companionable to his fellow-priests; devoted to his charge, but not shortsighted in his interests, realizing that the Church has claims on his co-operation beyond the bounds of his own parish, diocese and country; unobtrusive, tactful, and sympathetic; energetic, too, and manly; a leader to his people; pious without show and without sentimentalism, having in the strength, simplicity and sincerity of his devotion the secret of his ascendancy with souls. *On Paths of Holiness* is of real utility to a priest. Unfortunately, the translation could be better, and the price is very stiff.

The Holy Year, 1933-1934,⁹ by Fr. Martindale, S.J., is an excellent shilling's worth. It is not a history of Jubilees in general or of this Holy Year in particular. Just one chapter is devoted to a rapid historical survey; the rest of the book concerns the "mind" of the reigning Pontiff and of his immediate predecessors. The writer wants to put the minds of Catholics in tune with the great controlling ideas of the Holy See, so that this year of grace may achieve among us a new will to carry those ideas to glorious accomplishment. He links up the Papal teaching with the Jubilee Basilicas and with S. Croce, devoting a chapter to each. A short, graphic history of the basilica is first given. St. John Lateran, dedicated to the Baptist, is naturally linked with the spirit of penance, of sorrow for personal sins and reparation for others' sins, especially for injustice, which is responsible for the chaos of the times, and against which Leo XIII and Pius XI have striven so vigorously in their great social encyclicals. S. Mary Major's, Our Lady's ancient shrine, recalls what Our Lady stands for, the sanctity of marriage and motherhood, and the Christian education of children. S. Croce, the Basilica of the Passion, symbolizes the spirit of this Holy Year and reaffirms the value of suffering and of self-sacrifice for others. S. Peter's proclaims the need of religious authority and of the Papacy as the only centre of unity, and signifies also the rightness of due order and authority in States as against the soul-destroying tyranny of the anti-Catholic organization of Russianism. S. Paul's

⁹ Burns Oates & Washbourne. Wrapper, 1s.; cloth, 3s. 6d. pp. xv., 112.

stands for the missionary activity of the Church, in which all Catholics must take their share. Throughout, Fr. Martindale puts the Church's teaching and ideals strongly, clearly and persuasively. His little book will help every pilgrim to Rome and every other Catholic of goodwill to drink deep of the spirit of this year.

The Man of Sorrows, by Fr. Robert Eaton of the Birmingham Oratory,¹⁰ has now reached its third impression. After about seventy pages of preparatory matter, the remaining three hundred pages are devoted to the full story of the Passion itself in all its aspects. Each chapter is in the nature of a meditation, and will readily furnish material for private mental prayer or for a sermon. It would be an excellent book to have and to use during this Holy Year.

Several French spiritual books have been received. The outstanding one is "*Méditations sur les Mystères de notre Sainte Foi*." It is a revised edition of Père Jennesseaux' modern translation of the Ven. Louis du Pont's greatest work.¹¹ The original was published at Valladolid in 1605, and ran through three editions in four years, and was soon translated into almost all the European languages, into Latin and into Arabic. St. Francis de Sales recommends it in his *Devout Life*, and it was popular with Fr. Baker. It has been said that all the books of meditations that have appeared since du Pont's are more or less inspired by him, but none of them attains his supernatural tone, objective realism or theological depth. The present edition is beautifully printed on good paper. It opens with a biography of the writer and closes with an excellent index and useful tables distributing the meditations throughout the year and selecting suitable ones for two retreats of eight days.

Dans les Pas du Sauveur is a book of readings and meditations, teaching the doctrine and method of reparation. *Vertues Cachées de la Vie Religieuse* instructs religious on the daily practice of humility, simplicity, modesty, obedience and fraternal charity. *Prières d'un Croyant* is a book of simple meditations on Gospel themes by a lay professor of the University of Rennes. It inculcates eternal truths in a way suited to the present generation in France. *Soyez des Hosties*, now in its fourth edition, is a retreat for girls, taking the Mass as its subject. It appeals too much to sentiment. *Ange et Apôtre*, also in its fourth edition, is an excellent treatise on the love of God and man, based entirely on the teaching of St. Francis de Sales.

Holy Communion, Thoughts and Prayers, compiled by M. O'Leary,¹² is a beautiful booklet containing excerpts from the writings of saints and others and from the liturgy, arranged as meditative devotions for Holy Communion.

¹⁰ Sands & Co. pp. 378. 6s.

¹¹ Desclée de Brouwer et Cie. It is in six parts, containing in all about three thousand pages.

¹² Sands & Co. pp. 59. 1s.

MORAL CASES

PRE-NUPTIAL VOW.

Bertha took a private vow of perfect and perpetual chastity. After a few years, she disregarded the vow, and entered into the married state. How should her confessor direct her in these circumstances?

REPLY.

Let us assume, for the sake of clearness, that Bertha's vow was really the vow of chastity, not that of celibacy nor of virginity. It is necessary to make this assumption, since penitents sometimes confuse the vow of celibacy with that of chastity.

The vow of chastity binds Bertha to refrain all her life from all voluntary venereal pleasure, whether internal or external, whether lawful or unlawful. Consequently, by a sin against chastity, even if the sin were only internal, such as desire or complacency, Bertha would sin against both chastity and religion. By contracting marriage, she acted sinfully, because, as we assume, and as would normally be the case, she intended to consummate marriage without having obtained a dispensation from her vow.

When the marriage has been contracted by her, the common, and, if we are not mistaken, the universal teaching of divines has been, up to the present, that Bertha may not ask for marriage dues for she would then be violating her vow, but she may give them when requested by her husband, and indeed she is bound to do so, since she has undertaken all the obligations of marriage. The marriage is, of course, valid, in spite of her vow.

The obvious way out of the difficulty would be to petition for a dispensation from the vow. But apart from this, it is in accordance with the canons (canon 1312, 2) to hold that her husband can suspend the obligation of the vow, so long as, and whensoever, the keeping of her vow does prejudice to his conjugal rights, for since the marriage is valid, he at all events has acquired rights.

But Cardinal Gasparri gives quite a different solution of the case (*de Matrimonio*, edit. 1932, I, n. 428 sqq.). His Eminence tells us that we may invoke canon 1111 to solve the difficulty. In that canon, we are told that both parties to a marriage have equal rights and duties in respect of those acts that are proper to conjugal life, and that those rights and duties exist from the inception of the marriage. We may here altogether prescind from the fact that this canon abolishes the right, if it ever existed, which either party might claim, to refrain from

all conjugal relations for the space of two months, in order to have the time to consider the adoption of a more perfect state of life, such as life in religion.

We are told by Cardinal Gasparri (*ibid.*) that the canon (c. 1111) as first proposed to those who were drawing up the Codex Juris consisted of two parts. The first part was as follows: "Both parties to a marriage have equal rights and duties, from the inception of marriage, in respect of acts that are of their nature capable of generating offspring." The second part of the proposed canon was as follows: "A spouse, only in the case when he or she has taken a vow of chastity, may not ask for the marriage dues, though he or she may and should render them." To preclude all misunderstanding, it is well to have the Latin text of these two parts: 1. *Utrique coniugi ab ipso matrimonii initio aequum jus et officium est in ordine ad actus per se aptos ad proles generationem.* 2. *Conjux solum in casu quo castitatis voto teneatur, nequit petere debitum conjugale, licet reddere et possit et debeat.*

It will be noticed, as His Eminence points out, that the second part of the canon as proposed has been suppressed altogether. Secondly, instead of the words: "In respect of acts that are, of their nature, capable of generating offspring," the emended canon reads: "in respect of acts proper to conjugal life." Consequently, the Codex (c. 1111) has made it quite clear that from the inception of marriage both parties to a marriage have equal rights and duties, not only to marital intercourse, but also to all other acts that are proper to married life.

The revision is important. The reason for the changes made in the first form of the canon was, as the Cardinal tells us, this fact, namely, that from the inception of marriage the person (Bertha, in the case) who had taken a vow of chastity, was certainly forbidden to offer to her husband, with whom she was to spend her life by day and by night, the other ordinary expressions of conjugal love; and, furthermore, she could not accept them when offered to her by her husband, much less ask for them or reciprocate them, since all such signs of conjugal love would be so many sins contrary to her vow, and a direct and necessary preliminary to the consummated act.

This being so, a woman in those circumstances (Bertha, in the case), though living a conjugal Christian life, would be in a most serious occasion of continually sinning against her vow, and that for the whole period of her married life. The Church, therefore, in her maternal solicitude, in order to ease the conscience of the woman, and to help her to avoid so many sins, and to establish that peace of conscience that ought to exist especially in the state of Christian wedlock, has granted to her (Bertha, in the case) by virtue of the canon (c. 1111), a limited dispensation from her vow of chastity, to the end that she may exercise, even spontaneously, all lawful acts of conjugal life, though at the same time, she remains under her vow in respect of any act contrary to chastity, whether in

marriage or outside of it. On the death of her husband, if she survive him, she will be bound by her vow, that is, she may not enter into a second marriage without dispensation.

This interpretation of the canon is in conformity, His Eminence says, with the practice of the Sacred Penitentiary, for since the promulgation of the Code, that Tribunal has not granted a dispensation from such a vow after marriage has been contracted, because dispensation is given by law. In the case of Bertha, therefore, the confessor would tell her that she has the limited dispensation, as described, so that there is no need to apply to the Sacred Penitentiary for dispensation, nor to invoke the principle that the husband suspends the vow.

Similarly, if Bertha had vowed virginity but not perfect chastity, on contracting marriage without dispensation, she would commit a grievous sin, because she would expose herself to the certainty of violating her vow, prescinding, of course, from the case in which both parties, with mutual consent, agreed to remain continent.

When, however, the woman has contracted marriage, then the law (c. 1111) grants her a dispensation from the vow of virginity. Once marriage has been consummated, the vow becomes extinguished.

This interpretation of canon 1111 given by Gardinal Gasparri was new to the present writer. Possibly it may be new to some readers of the CLERGY REVIEW. It appears to be a sound interpretation, both on account of intrinsic reasons, and of the authority of the author cited.

HENRY DAVIS, S.J.

RESERVED CASES DURING PASCHAL TIME.

Is it a correct interpretation of Canon 899, §3, that during paschal time all censures, except those reserved to the Holy See, may be absolved by any parish priest?

F. B.

REPLY.

The canon states: "*Ipsa jure a casibus, quos quoque modo sibi Ordinarii reservaverint, absolvere possint tum parochi, alii qui parochorum nomine in jure censentur, toto tempore ad praeceptum paschale adimplendum utili, tum singuli missionarii quo tempore missiones ad populum haberi contingat.*" If the suggested interpretation is correct, it would follow that censures reserved by the law of the Code to Ordinaries, including the very common one of marriage before a Protestant minister, all cease to be reserved. The whole matter of censures and their reservation is so intricate and so variously interpreted, that one has to hesitate before deciding, with any degree of certainty, that a given interpretation is incorrect. Nevertheless, it does appear that, in this instance, a wrong deduction has been made, and that, pending an

authoritative decision in its support, the interpretation cannot safely be followed.

To perceive the point at issue a distinction must be made between (a) Cases reserved by the common law of the Church as contained in the Code, and (b) Cases reserved by Ordinaries in addition to those contained in the Code. The first category are reservations *propter censuram*, with the one exception of the sin mentioned in Canon 894, which is also reserved *propter peccatum*; it is not incorrect, though liable to cause confusion, to refer to these as Papal reservations, even though the absolution of a certain number of them is reserved to the Ordinary (Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, §514). The second category are usually reservations *propter peccatum*, but there is no reason why an Ordinary should not attach a censure to a given case and reserve it *propter censuram*; many Ordinaries never use the powers they possess in reserving to themselves certain cases, in addition to those contained in the common law of the Church, but, if they do use this power, the cases are known as strictly diocesan or episcopal reservations. The words *quoque modo* mean that the reservations cease, whether reserved by the Ordinary *propter peccatum* or *propter censuram* (Cf. Vol. III, page 45; and Vol. IV, page 278 where the classes of reservation and the terminology are discussed). Now, Canon 899, §3, deals solely with these episcopal cases, reserved by Ordinaries to themselves, and it cannot be applied to cases which are reserved to Ordinaries by the common law of the Church. Hence, it is incorrect to say that during paschal time all censures, except those reserved to the Holy See, may be absolved by the parish priest. In fact, I do not know of any canonist who commits himself to so liberal a view, though, no doubt, such are to be found. The commentators, more often than not, do not advert to the point, but their doctrine is clear from the context.

I will quote two authors who do deal explicitly with the matter. "The powers of the parish priest, therefore, are confined to the cases which the Ordinary reserves to himself. We must distinguish between a *casus Ordinario reservatus* and a *casus ab Ordinario reservatus*. The former is a case reserved by the Holy See, or by a Provincial or National Council, to the Ordinary; the reserving authority is superior to the Ordinary. The Canon quoted refers only to the latter class of cases, those reserved by the Ordinary to himself" (P. O'Neill in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XXVII (1926), page 518). "The faculties given by the law to pastors during the paschal season . . . do not include the power to absolve from the Papal cases reserved by the law to Ordinaries; for the Code gives them power to absolve from diocesan reserved cases, and the Papal cases reserved to Ordinaries are not diocesan reserved cases" (Woywood, *Practical Commentary* (1932), Vol. I, page 443). The whole context of the Code, in which this Canon occurs, is concerned only with cases reserved by the Ordinary, and the text of the Canons is taken, almost literally, from an Instruction of

the Holy Office, July 13th, 1916, which deals uniquely with the subject of *episcopal* reservations (Gasparri, *Fontes*, IV, p. 562).
E. J. M.

PASCHAL PRECEPT AND SANCTIONS.

What penalties and disabilities, if any, are incurred by Catholics who neglect the observance of the Paschal Precept?
J. K.

REPLY.

The famous decree of the Fourth Lateran Council, "Omnis utriusque sexus," added a sanction to the law: "alioquin et vivens ab ingressu ecclesiae areceatur et moriens christiana careat sepultura" (*Denzinger*, n. 437). From the wording of the law the penalties were what we should now call *ferendae sententiae*. Apart, therefore, from particular diocesan enactments, the penalties were not incurred *ipso facto* but only following on the intervention of ecclesiastical authority. The text of the Council is repeated in Canon 859, but the sanctions are omitted and are no longer part of the general law of the Church; they are likewise absent from the *Editio Typica* (1925) of the *Roman Ritual* (Tit. iv. cap. iii. *De Communione Paschali*). The liability of being deprived of ecclesiastical burial is, in addition, abolished from the terms of Canon 1240, which does not include the non-observance of the Paschal precept among the various actions meriting such a punishment.

To the offence, as such, no penalty is now directly attached. But it is worth noting that, indirectly, the delinquent may come within the terms of certain laws affecting "public sinners." But, for this purpose, it will be necessary to establish that the non-observance of the law is qualified by some other aggravating element, bringing the delinquent within the terms of Canon 1240 "alii peccatores publici et manifesti . . . nisi ante mortem aliqua dederint signa poenitentiae" (deprivation of ecclesiastical burial), or of Canon 1066 (marriage with a Catholic forbidden) or of Canon 2293 (definition of *infamia facti*). The application of Canons 1066 and 2293 offers less difficulty, since in both cases the intervention of the Ordinary is required: it is open to him to decide, in individual cases, whether marriage is forbidden or whether the person is affected by the disabilities consequent on *infamia facti*. To confine our attention to the refusal of ecclesiastical burial, the more recent commentators interpret the law in a mild sense and hold that neglect of the paschal precept does not necessarily constitute a person "peccator publicus et manifestus": they require, in addition, a manifest contempt for the law over a long period. Claeys Bouaert: "Non ut peccator publicus et manifestus habendus est ille qui semel aut iterum sacramenta confessionis et communionis in Paschate non suscepit. Hic casus enim in novo jure non jam recipitur et per se non est sufficiens ad denegandam sepulturam ecclesiasticam" (*Jus. Canon*, III, §53). J. Brys: "Opinamur nudum

factum non impletionis dictorum praeceptorum per aliquot annos non constitui aliquem ut peccatorem publicum et manifestum qualis a lege requiritur, sed requiri ut quis publice et manifeste a dictis praeceptis implendis abstinerit ex contemptu vel ex impietate, et absque signo poenitentiae defunctus sit" (*Collationes Brugenses*, XXV, p. 246).

The reason for this mild interpretation is the fact that the non-observance of the law does not necessarily imply an impious and irreligious attitude; nor is it necessarily accompanied by public scandal since the Church no longer requires the precept to be fulfilled in one's own parish church. Accordingly, in accordance with Canon 6, n. 4, the penalty which formerly existed is now abrogated. Undoubtedly, many cases of neglect of the precept are accompanied by aggravating circumstances constituting the delinquent a public sinner. In doubt, the Ordinary must be consulted, and the clergy need not be unduly severe in refusing to bury as a Catholic some person who has neglected the sacraments for a long period. "Omnes baptizati sepultura ecclesiastica donandi sunt, nisi eadem a jure expresse priventur" (Canon 1239, §3).

E. J. M.

THE JUBILEE.

How, exactly, does the Jubilee indulgence differ from any other plenary indulgence?

REPLY.

The question is not too easy to answer in a straightforward explicit manner. We all perceive, in a general and rather confused way, that the Indulgence of the Holy Year is an exceptional thing, and is superior to the various plenary indulgences granted, habitually and at all times, to the faithful who fulfil the necessary conditions. The idea is expressed in the papal Bulls which, following ancient custom, describe this indulgence not as *plenaria* but as *plenissima*. But a contentious or captious person may want to know the difference between "full" and "most full," or may want to know why he should go to Rome to gain an indulgence which may be gained at home by reciting the *En Ego* after receiving the Sacraments.

The writers who have given their minds to this question are all agreed that *substantialiter et entitative* there is no difference. "Jubilaeum etiam vocatur indulgentia plenissima, non quia per id ex mente Pontificis plus conceditur ad remissionem poenae quam in aliis indulgentiis plenariis . . ." (*Tract. De Indulg. Mechlinensis*, p. 56; Maroto in *Commentarium pro Religiosis*, 1933, p. 14). Therefore, if the difference is not *intrinsic*, it is to be sought in other accidental and extrinsic characteristics. There is, first of all, the purpose to consider. Indulgences are nowadays so similar in construction, that we are liable to lose sight of the fact that the remission of punishment is granted

in order to attract and persuade the faithful to perform certain acts of piety and religion. The indulgence attached to the Stations of the Cross thus differs from that attached to the Rosary. The purpose of the present Jubilee is the supreme one of increasing the love of Christ in the souls of men by turning their minds to the great mysteries of our Redemption. Moreover *plenissima* has a very exact meaning from the circumstance that, on the occasion of the Jubilee, wide and extensive faculties are given to Penitentiaries and confessors for the absolution of sins and censures which are normally reserved; there can be no remission of punishment unless the guilt of sin is removed, and therefore the remission is "most full" because the absolving powers of confessors are "most full."

Admittedly, one would like to find a more radical explanation of the difference, and the only one which commends itself turns on an examination of the subjective dispositions of the person gaining the indulgence. The conditions attached to any plenary indulgence, prayers, reception of the sacraments, etc., must be faithfully performed, but it is quite obvious that different persons will perform them with varying degrees of sorrow for sin, so much so that the certainty of having gained the promised remission can never be more than relative. This is well understood by the faithful and finds expression in Canon 926: "*Plenaria indulgentia ita concessa intelligitur ut si quis eam plenarie lucrari non possit, eam tamen partialiter lucretur pro dispositione quam habet.*" In other words, it is certainly the intention of the Church to concede a full remission of punishment, but it is uncertain whether individuals actually obtain the full effect of the favour granted. Now, on the occasion of a Jubilee Indulgence, the person who faithfully fulfils the conditions is more certain of having obtained it, because the pious works prescribed, the Roman pilgrimage and the onerous visits to the Basilicas, are more penitential and arduous, and therefore secure more perfect dispositions in the penitent. In addition, the dispositions of individuals are assisted and strengthened by the consciousness of solidarity with multitudes of the faithful performing together the same conditions.

This is, in substance, the explanation given by Leo XII in *Charitate Christi*, §4: "(fideles intelligant) plenariam esse indulgentiam jubilaei, et ab aliis etiam plenariis indulgentiis distinctam, quae in modum jubilaei conceduntur, propterea quod anno solemniss remissionis, qui jubilaum dicitur, amplior poenitentiae ministris ad hoc ipsum constitutis tribuitur facultas a peccatis absolvendi, et vincula atque impedimenta relaxandi, quibus non raro conscientium conscientia implicetur; dum autem universi christiani populi in coelum ascendit deprecatio, certior in omnes ampliorque placati poenitentia Domini descendit miseratio" (*Tract. Mechlin.*, *ibid.*; Cf. also Benedict XIV, *Apostolica Constitutio*, §13, ad finem; Gasparri, *Fontes*, II, p. 243).

E. J. M.

F

THE OATH ON A PROTESTANT BIBLE.

Is it lawful for a Catholic witness in a Court of Justice to take the Oath on a Protestant Bible? (H.D.)

REPLY.

(i) The act of swearing on a Protestant Bible cannot be considered a denial of the Catholic faith, or even an implied recognition of the sect whose version of the Scriptures is being used. It is simply an outward act of religion, supporting the veracity of the witness by showing reverence to the Word of God, whose name is solemnly invoked. The text is, in its substance, the Word of God. This is the conclusion given on two occasions in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. XIII, p. 64, and Vol. XXVI, p. 345, and also by a recent writer in the *Semaine Religieuse de Québec*, March, 1933, page 440. Prümmer is the only manualist, as far as I can discover, who deals with the point: "Licet jurare tangendo et osculando biblia haereticorum, sicut moris est in Anglia" (*Theol. Moralis*, 1931, Vol. I, §526 g). He relies on a reply of the Holy Office dated February 23rd, 1820: "Cum Protestantes officarii dominantur omnibus tribunaliis, curiis, doganis, publicisque gubernii tum civilibus tum militaribus officiis, modusque jurandi apud eos sit tactus et osculum Bibliorum; ubique biblia haeretica praebeantur tangenda et osculanda, solique clero concessum est ut juret admovendo manum ad pectus. Hoc posito, quaeritur an fideles inquietandi sint de modo qui invaluit tangendi et osculandi huiusmodi biblia. Resp. In casu et circumstantiis expositis respondendum esse negative, nempe non esse inquietandos" (Gasparri, *Fontes*, IV, p. 141). The careful wording of this text should be noticed. It was given for Quebec where, apparently, there was no option in choosing some other method of taking the oath, and the answer is in the familiar guarded form that, in the circumstances, the consciences of the faithful need not be disturbed. It is open to anyone to conclude that the reply bears the sense that the people may be left in good faith, an interpretation which would not necessarily imply that the action is intrinsically lawful. But, I think we may conclude, both from the reply and the teaching of the authors quoted, that the action is not intrinsically wrong.

(ii) But not everything which is in itself lawful is also expedient, and to be tolerated everywhere and always. If certain ill effects follow from an action which is in itself lawful, one must refrain from that action unless there is a proportionately grave reason for doing it. The ill effects are, perhaps, in this case not very considerable. But there is always the possibility of some scandal, especially in surroundings where the Protestant Bible is regarded as the symbol and sole rule of faith. Therefore, the correct answer to the question is that a Catholic, in this country and at the present time, should not use a Protestant Bible in Law Courts, because there is not the slightest reason

for so doing and his refusal will not usually be attended by any *incommodum*. Why then run the risk, slight thought it may be, of appearing to approve an heretical version of the Scriptures? There is no reason, because the law of this country allows anyone to swear in the Scottish fashion, as provided by Sec. 5 of the Oaths Act 1888. The witness lifts his hand and says: "I swear by Almighty God, as I shall answer to God at the Great Day of Judgment, that I will speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" (Cf. *Stone's Justices' Manual*, p. 388, note [q]). Far from there being any reason for using a Protestant Bible, there seems every reason to the contrary. The matter is often discussed in the Catholic Press, and it has become widely known and understood that no Catholic need use the Protestant Bible. The refusal to do so is a most excellent profession of faith, stressing in particular the fact that the Church is the official custodian of the Scriptures, and the faithful should be encouraged in their objection to the use of a non-Catholic version, an objection that is widely and conscientiously felt. Prümmer states that the practice is lawful "*sicut moris est in Anglia*," but I doubt whether it can be rightly called customary amongst us. If a question were put to the Holy Office to-day, asking whether it is lawful to use a Protestant Bible in places where an alternative form is allowed, there can be no doubt what the answer would be.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

SOME RECENT INDULGENCES.

(i) *The Angelus.*

We must first notice a recent decree which augments the indulgences attached to the Angelus, and re-states the conditions on which they may be gained. On February 20th, 1933, the Sacred Penitentiary declared that "all who, at the precise time fixed by the Supreme Pontiff Benedict XIII, or as soon afterwards as they are able, devoutly recite the prayer *Angelus Domini* with its collect, or (in its proper season) the antiphon *Regina coeli*, also with its customary collect, or, lastly, five *Hail Mary's*, may gain a partial indulgence of ten years as often as they perform this pious exercise with at least a contrite heart, and a plenary indulgence on the usual conditions if they do this for a whole month" (A.A.S., XXV, p. 71).

The purpose of the decree is, in part at least, expressed by the words of the preamble "ut maiorem populi christiani in hac etiam prece recitanda refoveat unitatem"; and where it conflicts with previous decrees, it must be understood to supplant them. Therefore it is no longer true to say that the indulgences are attached to the versicles and the *Hail Mary's*, and that the addition of the collect is merely a matter of custom.

On several other points, the new decree must be supplemented by older decrees which it quotes.

The Brief issued by Benedict XIII on September 14th, 1724, conceded a partial indulgence of 100 days for each recital; and other pontiffs, while modifying the original conditions, retained the same indulgence. The plenary indulgence, granted at the same time, even now remains unchanged. In the absence, therefore, of any hint to the contrary, it is presumed that the recitation of the Angelus *once a day* for a month—eo tempore quo mane, meridie aut vespere campanae pulsantur—still suffices to gain the plenary indulgence.

Besides the usual conditions—confession, communion and prayer for the Pope's intentions—Benedict XIII laid it down that the Angelus was to be said on bended knees, and at the sound of the Angelus bell.

Benedict XIV confirmed these provisions in 1742; but also declared that the Angelus should be said standing on Sundays, and the *Regina coeli* substituted in Paschal time. Those who were not able to say the *Regina coeli* were to say the Angelus, standing, throughout Paschal time.

In 1781, Pius VI extended the favour of the indulgences to

places where no bell is rung, provided that one said the prayers at the appointed times—morning, noon or evening.

Leo XIII, on April 3rd, 1884, decreed that the Angelus need not be said kneeling, or at the sound of the bell, by such as are reasonably prevented from complying with these conditions; also, that those who are neither able to read nor to recite the Angelus from memory, may gain the indulgence by saying the *Hail Mary* five times.

(ii) *A Friday Devotion in Memory of the Passion.*

The ringing of church bells at 3 p.m. each Friday was decreed by Pope Benedict XIV as a forcible weekly recall to the thought of Jesus Dying upon the Cross; and an indulgence of 100 days was granted to all who should at the same moment recite five Paters and Aves (Apostolic Letter "Ad Passionis," December 13th, 1740).

Our Holy Father Pope Pius XI once more commends this practice as one admirably calculated to promote devotion to the Passion and to signalize the Nineteenth Centenary of the Redemption. In accordance with a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary, dated January 30th, 1933, all the faithful who, when the bell is rung on Fridays at three o'clock or at any time fixed by local custom, recite five Paters and five Aves, adding an ejaculatory prayer such as "We adore Thee, O Christ, and we praise Thee, etc." for the Pope's intention, may gain 1° an indulgence of ten years if they are contrite, 2° a plenary indulgence on the usual conditions if they continue this devotion each Friday for a month. Where we can conveniently kneel, the prayers must be said kneeling (A.A.S., XXV, p. 70).

The original decree commanded the rectors of all Catholic churches throughout the world to have this bell rung every Friday. So far as any universal obligation is concerned, the law seems to have been abrogated by contrary custom which is not repudiated; but it should be noted that the new decree does not suggest that the indulgence can be gained where no bell is rung.

(iii) *The Holy Hour.*

The first Thursday of April, 1933, happened to be the first Thursday of the Jubilee Year. The Holy Father, therefore, took the opportunity to consecrate by his own example the pious practice of making a Holy Hour, on the evening preceding the first Friday of each month, in memory of Our Saviour's Agony in the Garden.

In an autograph Letter addressed to the Cardinal Vicar, the Pope expressed a wish that the faithful everywhere would join with him in this act of devotion, and offer it in particular for those countries where our loving Saviour is most outraged, so that all may return to the only way of salvation (A.A.S., XXV, p. 73).

The Letter was followed on March 21st by a decree of the

Sacred Penitentiary which again stressed the necessary connection between the Holy Hour and meditation on the Passion.

In future, all who perform this pious exercise for a whole hour in any church or public oratory, or, if they may lawfully use it, in any semi-public oratory, and pray also for the Pope's intention, may gain 1° a plenary indulgence, provided they duly confess their sins and receive Holy Communion; or 2° an indulgence of ten years, if they are at least contrite (A.A.S., XXV, p. 171).

(iv) *An Invocation to Our Holy Redeemer.*

An indulgence of 300 days is granted by a decree of March 23rd to any Catholic who recites with contrite heart the invocation "Te ergo quaesumus, tuis famulis subveni, quos pretioso Sanguine redemisti." The indulgence may be gained as often as the prayer is repeated (A.A.S., XXV, p. 172).

BOOK REVIEWS

The Passion and Death of Our Lord Jesus Christ. By the Most Reverend Alban Goodier, S.J. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1933. pp. xiv.+426. 10s. 6d.)

As His Grace Archbishop Goodier reminds us in his introduction, there are three main categories of books about Our Lord's life and Passion. There is, first, the purely devotional study; there is the historical treatment, full of minute enquiry into every kind of secondary circumstance, which is perhaps best represented in English by the translation of Belser's *History of the Passion*; finally, there is what might be called the psychological method, in which details are kept in their proper sphere and all attention is concentrated upon "the Passion as it really took place, not in its historical aspect only, but in the minds and hearts of those who went through it, especially of Him who was the central Figure" (p. ix.). The Archbishop's work belongs to the third class and the difference between it and many of its predecessors may be gauged by the degree of prominence consistently given to that central Figure. In many other histories there is such a concentration on details, often on details rather irrelevant to the main issue, that, at times, the central Figure seems to retire into the background. Here, on the contrary, the figure of Our Divine Saviour is always in the foreground of the picture and all other things are seen simply in their relation to Him. There must be few pages on which the Holy Name is not mentioned; there can, I think, be no page without a direct reference to Our Lord.

This must not, of course, imply that there is not every sign of constant study and meditation of what may be styled the accessories of the Sacred Passion. The Archbishop has visited the country of Jesus, has read many commentaries, and has consulted many other authorities. The learning is there, though it is unobtrusive. Occasionally, in reading the book, I have met with small points on which I would venture to dis-

agree with the author. So (p. xii.), it does not seem likely that the Antonia was Pilate's ordinary residence in Jerusalem; (p. 9) the traditional House of Caiphas was not in the Lower City; (p. 356) *Eloi, eloi*, the Marcan form of the Fourth Word, is Aramaic, not "Hebrew, the language of the Prophets and the Psalms"; (p. 335) it is precarious to argue from the length of a hyssop-stalk in regard of the height of the Cross, since the better reading may well be *hyssô*, "javelin" rather than *hyssôpô*, "hyssop," in John xix. 29. (See the evidence fully stated in Bernard's *St. John*, ICC, ii., p. 640.) But these matters are relatively unimportant. I feel quite certain that the fortunate readers of this wonderfully beautiful and impressive book will be delighted not only with its masterly presentation of the mind of Christ but with the constant help that is given, particularly in the very difficult matter of topography, towards a clear view of all the circumstances of the Sacred Passion.

We have had some foretaste of this complete study in the earlier works on *The Crown of Sorrow* (1918) and *Jesus Christ, the Son of God* (1920), and throughout the present book we are constantly put in mind of His Grace's pamphlet *A More Excellent Way*, with its gentle insistence upon the need for a greater knowledge of the Divine Master's personality as it is revealed to us in His inspired Scriptures. "Above all read the Scriptures; especially the Gospels; with an eye less upon ourselves and more upon Him whom they describe; in that, more than in any other reading, shall we find that knowledge and true spirituality grow together" (p. 22). Of all these works we can say to the prospective reader that they will surely lead him to answer the questions: "How does the Passion reveal Christ to us? What manner of Man does He show Himself during that ordeal? What were His thoughts and feelings? What was His soul? And hence, knowing that He is 'yesterday, and to-day, and the same for ever,' what is the meaning of Jesus crucified to me here and now?" (Present work, p. x.). And so each of us may repeat the words of Blessed John Fisher, spoken after he had read John xvii. 3-5, on his way to martyrdom: "Here is even learning enough for me unto my life's end."

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

The Life of Jesus. By Maurice Goguel, Docteur es Lettres, Docteur en Théologie, D.D. (St. Andrews); Director of Studies at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes (Sorbonne); Professor at the Faculté libre de Théologie Protestante (Paris). Translated by Olive Wyon. (George Allen & Unwin, 1933. pp. 592. £1 5s.)

This English translation of Professor Maurice Goguel's *Vie de Jésus* does not call, as a whole, for a lengthy notice. A review of the French original, published in the summer of last year, appeared in the August number of this periodical (see Vol. iv., pp. 151-3). A summary of the book was given and particular attention was called to the author's arbitrary and capricious

method of determining the historicity of his sources. Since then long reviews have been printed in the *Revue biblique* for October, 1932 (pp. 598-614) and in *Recherches de Science Religieuse* for April, 1933 (pp. 247-50). The respective authors of these reviews, Père Lagrange, O.P., and Père Huby, S.J., have said all that need be said about the book and I refer readers to their criticisms for further information.

One point should, however, be noted. We are told in the preface to the English edition that the translation was submitted before publication to Professor Goguel and that "he has introduced a certain number of changes into the text and the notes for the English edition" (p. 13). In the light of this remark, it may be suggested that in a second edition, either Dr. Goguel or his translator might well correct his travesty of Père Lagrange's words in the latter's preface to *L'Evangile de Jésus-Christ* (Gabalda, Paris, 1928, p. vi.). Goguel's contention is that "scepticism or at least agnosticism, in all that concerns the history of Jesus, is a state of mind which is very widespread" (p. 59-60). As instances of this state of mind he mentions Père L. de Grandmaison, S.J., and Père M. J. Lagrange, O.P. Lagrange's statement is that he has given up the idea of writing "une 'Vie de Jésus' selon le mode classique, pour laisser parler davantage les quatre évangiles, insuffisants comme documents historiques pour écrire une histoire de Jésus-Christ comme un moderne écrirait l'histoire de César Auguste, etc." Clearly Lagrange's meaning is that the Gospels, on account of their somewhat fragmentary character, their silence regarding so many years of Our Lord's life, and their frequent lack of chronological and geographical details, are incomplete records. This would be admitted by everybody. To take such a commonplace as evidence of "scepticism or at least agnosticism" argues a certain lack of perception. As Lagrange drily remarks in his review of Goguel: "Les meilleures plaisanteries sont les plus courtes. M. Goguel n'aurait pas dû revenir sur celle-là" (p. 598, n. 1). It is evidently Professor Goguel's duty, as regards future editions, to admit his mistake and withdraw the comment. The remark on the late Père de Grandmaison that he abandoned the idea of writing a life of Jesus "by simply ignoring the problem altogether" (loc. cit.) suggests a misunderstanding of the purpose of Père de Grandmaison's *Jesus Christ*, which is an apologetic work, not a biography. Hence, in neither case has Goguel's *mauvaise plaisanterie* the smallest real justification.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

The Collegiate Chapel, Cork. By the Rev. Sir John O'Connell, K.C.S.G., M.A., LL.D. (Cork University Press and Longmans. 2s. 6d.)

The Irish Universities Act of 1908 enacted that no part of public money should be applied for the maintenance or provision of any place of religious worship. Sir John O'Connell describes the Act as a measure of elementary and very meagre justice,

and the restriction as a dishonouring condition. Chiefly through his efforts, money was found to supply the deficiency for Cork, and through his kindly personal attention, in consultation with Sir Bertram Windle and other distinguished scholars, a chapel of remarkable beauty and appropriateness was produced. His modest, but well arranged, volume gives a brief history of the undertaking, and a detailed description of what amounts to an important artistic achievement. Sir John and his advisers boldly decided to break with the venerable custom of erecting stereotyped churches after designs of foreign importation, and to build in an adapted and revitalized version of the ancient Hiberno-Romanesque style. The right architect was chosen in Mr. J. F. McMullen. A team of enthusiastic artists co-operated with the architect with the happy result that every detail of furnishing and decoration blends into perfect harmony with his design.

In his introductory notes on the principles of church building, Sir John O'Connell sets an ideal standard which, unfortunately, can rarely be attained by reason of economic and social conditions. The ancient Irish style would not successfully bear transplantation to English soil; nevertheless, the Cork Collegiate Chapel has set an example of good taste and decorum which might well be imitated. The S.C. of Propaganda has approved of the adaptation of Chinese art to the needs of Chinese Christians. Sir John O'Connell's admirable revival of Irish ecclesiastical art stimulates a hope that a revival of English ecclesiastical art, as against foreign importations, for English Catholics may not be far off.

J. P. REDMOND.

St. Jerome: The Early Years. By Paul Monceaux. (pp. xi., 187. Sheed & Ward. 6s.)

St. Jerome shares the fate of all the Fathers of the Church in being unknown to the general body of the faithful. Possibly it would not be wise to make him too widely known; for "a sick man and an irascible, with a heart of gold, but unquiet in mind and biting of tongue" (p. 187), would not always edify; and edification is of the essence of hagiography. But for readers who can discriminate, nothing but good would accrue from a close acquaintance with one of the finest scholars and most brilliant writers that the early Church produced. In fact, all ought to know something of St. Jerome, because we are all so deeply in his debt for the official Latin version of the Sacred Scriptures.

M. Monceaux has given us a rapid sketch of the Saint's life up to the age of thirty, brightly and attractively written; and he has adorned his work with illustrations from the great artists who delighted in depicting St. Jerome. The writer has a scholar's knowledge of his subject himself, his times and his incomparable works. In the matter of chronology he departs considerably from the traditional reckoning accepted on the word

of St. Prosper of Aquitaine, but he amply justifies his reduction of St. Jerome's life by sixteen years. He also rectifies the general impression that St. Jerome the hermit was an old, decrepit man. Actually, the Saint's eremitical life extended from his twenty-eighth to his thirtieth year.

The reader experiences one great dissatisfaction with this book. The account ends when St. Jerome is on the eve of the most glorious period of his life. One has grown fascinated by his story. But it is a story without its natural development, in which the curtain falls before the play proper has begun.

J. CARTMELL.

Father Olier. Translated from the French of the Very Rev. Pierre Pourrat by the Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., D.D., D.SS. (The Voice Publishing Company, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md. pp. 223. \$2.)

This short life is intended to capture the ordinary reader's interest in the Founder of S. Sulpice. The writer, P. Pourrat, Superior of the Solitude of Issy, is an acknowledged authority on the history of spirituality. He composed the life for Flammarion's "Les Grands Coeurs" series, the rules of which preclude footnotes and bibliography, and demand that the subject be portrayed from the angle of his activity. Hence we are given a rapid survey of the prodigious work of M. Olier, in a manner that is always readable and interesting. It will certainly induce its reader to want to know more of M. Olier's history, especially his spiritual history, which is given here only in glimpses in accordance with the restrictions imposed by the rules of the series. Those who want a short account of M. Olier will find in this book just what they desire.

J. CARTMELL.

Men Who Left the Movement. By Gertrude Donald. (pp. x, 422. Burns Oates & Washbourne. 10s. 6d.)

The author deals with only four of the men who left the Oxford Movement—Cardinals Newman and Manning, Mr. Allies and Fr. Maturin, three of the pioneers and one modern instance. She confines herself to the actual matter of conversion—the approach to it, the struggles it involved and the circumstances of its accomplishment. These are all set forth amply from the writings of the men concerned and their correspondents. They are allowed to speak at length for themselves in their own letters. We find little or nothing in the book that is not already printed in the large literature of the subject, but it was a useful task to gather it together, and this has been amply and ably accomplished.

D.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. ROME.

BY THE REV. RICHARD L. SMITH, Ph.D., M.A.,
Vice-Rector of the English College.

Since last I wrote the hub of affairs has moved to Washington, but not before Mr. MacDonald was followed in Rome by Herr von Papen, Captain Göring and Doctor Dollfuss. In this city of two polities, they had lengthy interviews with the Holy Father and with Cardinal Pacelli as well as with Signor Mussolini. Everybody presumes that the main subject of discussion was the proposed *Anschluss*, and everybody also supposes that both the Vatican and the Palazzo di Venezia were against any absorption of Austria in a pan-Germanic organization. I see no reason to doubt the correctness of this general persuasion, though the reasons which moved the statesmen of Church and State will have been somewhat different.

From the religious point of view it would be a pity to see another avowedly Catholic State lose its autonomy. This does not imply any condemnation of Hitlerism. It is far too early to make any estimate of the new régime in Germany and the Vatican is not given to acting precipitately. Indeed—as Jean Carère used to insist, almost *ad nauseam*—the patience of Rome is proverbial: the Church, viewing things as She does *sub specie aeternitatis*, never need act in unreflecting haste. This patience is very evident to-day. The continued presence of Monsignor Tedeschini at the Nunciature in Madrid is one example of it, the appointment of a new Primate at Toledo another. The Spanish Government is to be given every chance, and one can only hope that the Vatican's forbearance may be rewarded. The same holds good of Mexico, where under a hundred daily slights and injustices the Church preserves a heroic restraint. So, too, in Germany we need expect no immediate action. The German episcopate, while intervening humanely on behalf of the Jews, has also lifted its bann on Herr Hitler. For the time being we must wait. Any Catholic condemnation of the Nazis will be of their own seeking and after vast provocation, just as any Catholic approval of their policy will be on their own merit. To-day and always the Church inculcates obedience to established Governments. And therefore it seems a strange paradox of spite that politicians should ever make antagonization of the Church a plank in their platforms.

But if no one yet knows what to say of Hitlerism itself, there can be no doubt that it has delayed any chance of revision of the Treaty of Versailles. Sir Austen Chamberlain's speech has been noted here in Rome. Revision is the only possible means of producing the will to peace in Europe, but it cannot be yet. The trend of foreign policies ever since the Peace has been away from Versailles and towards Pope Benedict's suggestions. Not that Versailles is a uniquely bad treaty. It is the fashion to

decry it at the moment, just as all the text books make merry over the Treaty of Vienna a hundred years before. Versailles contained many good things, but it was not consistent with itself. Still, what treaty on such a scale has ever been consistent? In so far as men are the creatures of circumstance, so must man-made agreements be. Again, the world needs patience and calm, two qualities which must impress anyone who has passed immediately from the clamour of the streets into the courteous peace of the Vatican City. So, it may not be wholly a loss that the question of revision has been shelved for the moment and that statesmen have turned to the discussion of economics, a discussion for which London and Washington are fit *foci*.

Meanwhile the Holy Year goes from strength to strength. The Holy Father has never given audience to less than 4,500 persons a day since the opening of the Holy Door. Easter Sunday was a triumph. Many journalists have tried to capture its wonder. Personally I hesitate between the peak moments of the silence which fell on that huge crowd in the Piazza of St. Peter's when the Pope began the prayers before the blessing *Urbi et Orbi* and the roar of enthusiasm which greeted the declaration of a plenary indulgence. The City is one vast hive of prayer, the very streets are sanctified by the pilgrimages passing from one basilica to another. And not a pilgrim goes away without kneeling at the feet of the Father of Christendom and receiving his blessing. Groups of members of Parliament from various countries, thousands of *contadini* from the Agro Romano, toiling up the steps of the Scala Regia driving sheep and hens before them as the only things they had to give the Pope. Here is a lesson in unity for the whole world, and when so many, already one in the things that matter most, are praying heaven for unity and peace between the nations, surely God must pour down His grace on those who guide the world, and help us all to heal the wounds of schism. The Holy Father told the Venerable English College that one of his intentions for the Holy Year is the conversion of England—*fiat unum ovile et unus pastor*. That is a prayer we may echo and extend to the whole world, *per universum mundum*, not only in the unity of Faith, though that most of all, but also in the unity of Charity, one towards another, without which this poor civilization of ours must soon commit suicide.

II. CENTRAL EUROPE.

By C. F. MELVILLE.

Austria and Germany.

Austria is heading for a crisis of the first magnitude. In diplomatic circles it is expected that matters will come to a head with a final trial of strength between the Christian Social (Clerical) Government of Herr Dollfuss and the Nazis in about six weeks' time.

Coming events cast their shadows. The clashes between the

Nazis and the Heimwehr (supporters of the Dollfuss Government) which have already taken place are indicative of the growing tension. But most significant of all, perhaps, are the strained relations between Germany and Austria which have followed upon the "Frank incident." Dr. Frank, the Nazis' Minister of Justice in Bavaria, had made a speech in which he said that Germany might have to invade Austria. Then Dr. Frank, and a number of other German Nazi notables, decided to visit Vienna for the celebrations of the historic liberation of Vienna from the Turks. Dr. Frank was informed by the Austrian Government that his presence was unwelcome. Later, addressing local Nazis, Dr. Frank insulted the Dollfuss Government. Ever since there has been official recrimination between Berlin and Vienna.

Dr. Dollfuss is striving to keep at bay the forces both of Hitlerism and Socialism (the "Red" and the "Brown" Bolshevists respectively, as the Austrian Clerical Press calls them). He is, moreover, continuing the tradition of the late Mgr. Seipel, of trying to preserve the independence of Austria. Consequently, he is opposed to the attempts of the local Austrian Nazis—who are directed by the German Nazis from over the frontier—to bring about a Hitlerist *coup* in Austria. A successful Nazi *coup* in Austria would, of course, mean a *de facto* *Anschluss* (Austro-German Union).

It should be clearly understood that whereas in Germany at the moment the Vatican is trying to build a bridge between the Catholic Centrum and the Hitlerist régime, in Austria the Church stands behind Herr Dollfuss and his Catholic party in their attempts to stem the Hitlerist tide.

Herr Dollfuss has indicated where he stands ideologically. In a recent declaration he said the aim of his government was to "*assure the independence of Austria on all sides.*" He was conscious, he said, of "*the common destiny which unites us with the Reich,*" but he added that "*Austria has always had a special mission as a Kulturtrager for the peoples of the East.*" The Austrian people, in his view, could render special services as a bridge between these peoples and the West, and, as a second German State, to the Germanic world, but she could best work out this destiny "*in full liberty and independence.*"

Herr Dollfuss, at the time of writing, has decided to go to Rome for Whitsuntide for the signing of the Concordat between the Vatican and the Austrian Republic. Herr Hitler thinks of going to Rome at the same time. The two Chancellors may meet in the Eternal City. The Concordat will probably be incorporated in the Austrian Constitution.

Czechoslovakia.

The results of the policy of Mgr. Hlinka, the leader of the Slovak Peoples' Catholic Party, were made very clear at the Sixth Party Congress held at Zilina on April 20th last. The speeches of the leaders marked the radicalization of the party and the rôle played by youths in its conduct. Undoubtedly,

the "Popularists," as the Slovak Clericals are called, have established a strong position amongst the youth of Slovakia. But, in spite of this radicalism, the party of Mgr. Hlinka remains profoundly attached to the Czechoslovak State. At the Congress at Zilina, it was made clear that the party was as opposed as ever to treaty revision or the handing back of any Slovak territory to Hungary.

Turning to purely Church matters, it is to be noted that the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia is about to constitute a special vicariate for the Province of Subcarpathic-Russia. As the membership of the Church is not very numerous in that province, it has been administered hitherto by the episcopal vicariate of Bratislava. The constitution of an independent vicariate shows that the Church's propaganda has been successful.

It is also interesting to learn that the Czechoslovak congregations of the Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, whose mother house is at Prerov, in Moravia, have offered their services to the Government of British Guiana. Their offer is to nurse in the leper districts and to educate young girls.

Jugoslavia.

During a recent debate in the Yugoslav Chamber Senate, M. Andjelovitch, deputy, and M. Chverliouga, senator, asked the Yugoslav Government to regulate the relations between Jugoslavia and the Holy See by means of a Concordat.

Dr. Voyislav Janitch, writing in a recent issue of Dr. Lazar Marcovitch's organ, *L'Esprit de Belgrade*, says that this regulation of relations is absolutely necessary. There are, he writes, 5,500,000 Catholics in Jugoslavia whose situation *vis-à-vis* the State is not yet clearly defined. The Orthodox Church has already regularized its relations with the State by means of the Serbian Orthodox Church Law of 1929, and by the organic statute of the Serbian Orthodox Church of 1931. The Moslems have had their position defined by the relevant law of 1930 and the organic statute of 1930. Likewise the Jews and Protestants, by means of special laws for the purpose. The same does not yet apply to the Catholic Church, and it is desirable that her judicial and political relations with the State should be defined, in accord with the Holy See.

Dr. Janitch says that there are two schools of thought on this matter in Jugoslavia. One school of thought holds that the Concordat is necessary, which, in the view of Dr. Janitch, is just and reasonable, and accords with the attitude which was adopted since before the War by the Serbian Government presided over by the late M. Nicola Pashitch which signed the Concordat of June 24th, 1914: *Concordato stipulato fra la Sante Sede ed il Governo de Serbia*.

M. Pashitch adopted the same attitude in 1928 when he sent a special delegation to Rome to negotiate a Concordat between the Vatican and Jugoslavia. The other school of thought is against a Concordat, considering that the State has the right to regulate by itself the position of the Catholics in the State,

and holding the view that the best solution of religious problems would be by an inter-denominational religious law applicable to all the religious bodies.

The point of view of this school of thought is, says Dr. Janitch, supported by "*a great international secret society which has a certain number of adherents in Yugoslavia, and whose attempts to meddle in the public affairs of our country have been remarked during recent times.*"

A *propos* the attempt at a Concordat in 1925, Dr. Janitch declares: "*I was one of the Yugoslav delegates and I can bear testimony to the good faith and great comprehension of the Vatican on all essential questions on that occasion.*"

Dr. Janitch continues that in his opinion a Concordat between the Vatican and Yugoslavia is possible to-day. "*For our country,*" he says, "*it is a question upon which external peace depends to a great extent. Furthermore, logic and justice speak in favour of a Concordat . . . the Catholic Church is the greatest world Christian organization . . . she asks of Yugoslavia only PAX ET LIBERTAS. . . . The Catholic religion is as much the national religion of Yugoslavia as is the Orthodox Church. To live in peace with the Catholic Church is good sense.*"

I have quoted but a few passages from Dr. Janitch's remarkable article. They should suffice, however, to throw a good deal of light on the subject of the relations of the Church and Yugoslavia. Dr. Janitch's article, moreover, confirms in spirit what I wrote in these columns some months ago, i.e., that the difficulties in regard to the Catholics in Yugoslavia to-day are not connected with the Serb-Croat question *per se*. The majority of the Serbs—including the King himself and most of the more responsible statesmen—are exceedingly tolerant on religious matters, and desire nothing better than amiable and equitable relations between all the religious bodies, including the Catholics, and the State. The recent difficulties which have crept into the situation have been due mainly to the anti-clerical and free-masonic elements in otherwise Catholic Slovenia and Croatia: men like Mr. Kramer and others.

It is essential that Catholics in Western Europe should not confuse the internal political disputes between Serbs and Croats or the internal political differences between the Opposition Federalists and the Centralists of the Dictatorial régime with the Catholic question *per se*. The Church herself is careful to keep clear of these internal political questions, as the tactful diplomacy of the Papal Nuncio, Mgr. Pelegrinetti, has abundantly made clear.

Personally, I believe that good faith on both sides will eventually lead to the conclusion of a Concordat, which will be in the best interests both of the Church and the Yugoslav State. The personality of men like the present Yugoslav Foreign Minister, M. Jevtitch, who is, by the way, a personal friend of King Alexander, is a good augury of a happy and just solution of this important problem.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

The most considerable commentary on the Jubilee Indulgence that has appeared in the periodicals is from the pen of Fr. Maroto in *APOLLINARIS* for January-March of this year. After a general discussion on the Holy Year and the fruits to be expected from its observance, the author comments on the conditions for gaining the indulgence, and the various questions connected with the privileged classes who may gain it without making the Roman Pilgrimage. The text is repeated, in part, in *COMMENTARIUM PRO RELIGIOSIS*. Also connected with the Holy Year is a contribution by Canon Boylan, in *STUDIES* for March, on the date of the Crucifixion, in which the reasonable and well-founded theory, which places the date on April 3rd, A.D. 33, is explained. The theory has gained enormously in prestige owing to the Holy Father's action, and it may lead to further consideration of the question of a fixed Easter. In the same number Sir M. F. O'Dwyer writes on the *Adventures of Bishop Edmund O'Dwyer, 1640-1654*, and Professor Daniel A. Binchy on *Adolf Hitler*. While not disputing his personal honesty and disinterestedness, the writer believes that the secret of his power lies in his fanatical belief in himself and his mission, which has become for him a kind of religion. It is a phenomenon not peculiar to Hitler or to Germany. Other articles by Aubrey Gwynn on *Philip II of Spain*, and by William Dawson and Edward J. Coyne on *Arthur Cleary* and *Karl Marx* make up quite a strong biographical number.

In *ANGELICUM*, fasc. 2, Fr. C. Freithoff discusses the question of Our Lady's merit: "possumus concedere meritum ex parte humani generis ad incarnationem, sed tunc nihil aliud significetur, quam impleta fuisse omnia quae secundum divinum consilium ante incarnationem impleri debuerunt. Meritum vere proprie dictum, sive sit de condigno sive sit de congruo, sive SS Patrum, sive etiam Beatissimae Virginis Matris Mariae, se non potest extendere ad substantiam incarnationis, quia principium meriti non cadit sub merito." In the same number Fr. J. M. Vosté, O.P., contributes the first portion of an extensive study *De Conceptione Virginali Jesu Christi*. The same writer in fasc. 2 of *DIVUS THOMAS* continues his study of Albertus Magnus as a commentator on the Psalms. The first place in *ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE*, Heft 2, is given to an article by Fr. F. Lakner, S.J., on *Kleutgen* and his influence on ecclesiastical studies in Germany during the nineteenth century. *REVUE DES SCIENCES RELIGIEUSES* for April contains two contributions of historical interest, the one on some unpublished works of *John Gerson* by E. Vansteenberghe and the other by Jean Rivière on *The Dogma of the Redemption in the Writings of St. Bernard*.

In the May MONTH Fr. L. E. Bellanti, S.J., concludes his study of the *Catechism Problem*, in which he pleads that a new "lex orandi" with its re-orientation to Christ, calls for a revision of our "lex credendi": "The Catechism as the basis of our instruction in school and in church, does not, owing to its date and origins, supply this need. With very little alteration it could do so and secure a new lease of life. The objections to such limited alterations when fairly considered can be as fairly answered." Not everyone will be disposed to agree with even this moderate programme, but the author is most careful to insist that it rests with ecclesiastical authority to define the scope and adjust the limits within which such a revision may be taken in hand. Fr. Thurston, S.J., in the same number, gives, with his usual discrimination, some more reflections on Teresa Neumann, comparing the phenomena with other cases of abnormal behaviour.

The CATHOLIC WORLD for May includes a useful study of Mrs. Wilfrid Ward's novels by Virginia M. Crawford, and most of us will agree that, to the younger generation to-day, the novels appear to be incurably romantic and excessively reticent. Yet her works will survive not so much through the brilliance of her talents as through the light they throw on the social life of their epoch and on the ethical problems that occupied the minds of the people of their day. The late Mrs. Ward did this for Catholics more truthfully than any other Catholic writer of her generation. A contribution by Joseph L. O'Brien deals excellently with *John England, Bishop of Charleston*, as an Apostle of the Press. A pioneer in this work, he charted the way for the Catholic Press in the United States, and it may be doubted whether the work of contemporary journalism equals his in vision and scope and in the services rendered to the Church.

In BLACKFRIARS for May, Michael de la Bedoyere argues for the voluntary abolition of conscription by the European powers, as the one genuine and practicable step which will really avert the danger of war. This abolition of conscription is demanded not so much by utilitarian considerations as by a sense of moral justice and freedom, a moral sense to which in other respects a democracy like France is very much alive. F. A. Kemmis Betty discusses the changing trend of Capitalism in an examination of John Strachey's book, *The Coming Struggle for Power*.

With the issue of April 8th, AMERICA, the bright and informative Catholic weekly, has reached its twenty-fifth year. We are always confident of finding some matter of outstanding importance discussed in each issue, and its scope is by no means confined to the United States. A recent article by Fr. Wilfred Parsons, S.J., on the Ogino-Knaus theory, so ably discussed by Fr. H. Davis in last month's issue of this REVIEW, has given rise to some controversy on the moral aspects of the question. Relying on the instruction of the Holy See, in 1880, Fr. Parsons stresses the fact that the exclusive use of the "Safe Period" is not allowable in all and every case; according to the intention

and circumstances of the agent it may be blameworthy. The chief article in the April number of the CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN is a thoughtful study by Fr. Alphonsus Bonnar, O.F.M., on *Birth Prevention in Pure Ethics*. Contraceptive intercourse is not designed by Nature to fulfil any purpose at all, and scarcely gets nearer to true sexual intercourse than does masturbation.

Amongst the non-Catholic Reviews, the REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES for April contains an article by Helen L. Gardner on the authorship of the *Cloud of Unknowing*. She thinks it highly improbable that Walter Hilton wrote this work, although she has no other suggestion to make concerning the problem. In the HIBBERT JOURNAL Miss Evelyn Underhill writes on the spiritual significance of the Oxford Movement, insisting especially on the importance of the Religious Communities. In the same number, Professor Richardson of Birmingham University replies to Dr. Bevan's criticisms of Bishop Barnes in an article introduced by the Bishop.

The volume of periodical literature is enormous and some estimate may be formed from the facts printed in a BLUE BOOK by the *University Grants Committee*. During the period 1931-2 there was a fall of expenditure to the extent of £16,000 on books and a rise of £5,000 in expenditure on periodicals, compared with the previous year. The Committee rightly regard this as disquieting, for the periodical interest may eventually secure the first call on limited funds. But, even within the sphere of theological and ecclesiastical interests, it is impossible to keep *au courant* with topical subjects except by means of the periodicals. Their perusal at least encourages a healthy curiosity in living and actual problems.

E. J. M.

